PROCEEDINGS

of the

Massachusetts Historical Society

SHL
WITHDRAWN

Committee of Publication

ROBERT EARLE MOODY, *Chairman*

BERNARD BAILYN

LYMAN HENRY BUTTERFIELD

MALCOLM FREIBERG

STEPHEN THOMAS RILEY

CLIFFORD KENYON SHIPTON

WALTER MUIR WHITEHILL

PROCEEDINGS

of the

Massachusetts Historical Society

VOLUME LXXIII

JANUARY-DECEMBER, 1961

Boston

Published by the Society

1963

Committee of Publication

ROBERT EARLE MOODY, *Chairman*

BERNARD BAILYN

LYMAN HENRY BUTTERFIELD

MALCOLM FREIBERG

STEPHEN THOMAS RILEY

CLIFFORD KENYON SHIPTON

WALTER MUIR WHITEHILL

PROCEEDINGS

of the

Massachusetts Historical Society

VOLUME LXXIII

JANUARY–DECEMBER, 1961

Boston
Published by the Society
1963

COPYRIGHT 1963 BY THE
MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Published at the Charge of the Waterston Funds

THE ANTHOENSEN PRESS, PORTLAND, MAINE, U.S.A.

Preface

READERS *familiar with earlier volumes of the* PROCEEDINGS *of the Massachusetts Historical Society will quickly note that the present one is considerably slimmer than its predecessors. A word or two on the change is in order.*

Since earlier volumes in this series encompassed two, three, or even four years of Society business, publication of a volume occasionally occurred only well after the period it covered. However unavoidable, such delays benefited no one, least of all subscribers, contributors, or the Society. To meet this problem, the Committee of Publication of the Massachusetts Historical Society voted on December 6, 1961, *to alter the format and contents of future volumes of* PROCEEDINGS, *beginning with* LXXIII (1961), *by making each a paper-bound annual covering one calendar year rather than a hard-bound volume covering two or more Society years. (But to meet the needs of subscribers wanting some uniformity in their holdings of sets of* PROCEEDINGS, *the Committee agreed to make available in hard covers—and at an added cost—a small portion of the edition of each volume beginning with* LXXIII.)

The result of the Committee's action (it was reported to the membership of the Society on December 14, 1961) *is apparent in the present volume. Succeeding ones, like this one, will carry forward the volume numbering already in use with the earlier and fatter issues. We hope that unlike them future numbers will cost less, although it is futile to predict how production costs will determine selling prices even a few years hence.*

In any case, the thinner volumes of PROCEEDINGS *will appear more frequently and more regularly than did their stouter predecessors. The hope is to get each new number after this one into print by October of the year following the one it covers. Subscribers, contributors, and the Society should all benefit from the change.*

MALCOLM FREIBERG
Editor of Publications

January 16, 1963

STEPHEN THOMAS RILEY
Director and Librarian

WARREN GAGE WHEELER
Assistant Librarian

JOHN DANIEL CUSHING
Assistant Librarian

CLIFFORD KENYON SHIPTON
Sibley Editor

LYMAN HENRY BUTTERFIELD
Adams Editor

MALCOLM FREIBERG
Editor of Publications

Contents

Papers: PAGE

Ancient Rome and Modern America Reconsidered, by Mason Hammond 3

Father Abbey's Will, by George T. Goodspeed 18

James Burgh and American Revolutionary Theory, by Oscar and Mary Handlin 38

The Peace Convention of February, 1861, by Samuel Eliot Morison 58

Some Experiences of My Political Life, by Henry L. Shattuck 81

Random Recollections of a Publisher, by Alfred A. Knopf 92

Memoir:

Lawrence Waters Jenkins, by Ernest S. Dodge 107

Meetings 111

Index 165

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/massachusetts-historical-society-proceedings_january-december-1961_73

Officers of the
Massachusetts Historical Society

October 11, 1962

President

Thomas Boylston Adams

Vice-Presidents

Henry Latimer Seaver

Stephen Wheatland

Recording Secretary

Walter Muir Whitehill

Corresponding Secretary

James Barr Ames

Treasurer

John Bryant Paine, Jr.

Cabinet-Keeper

Edward Pierce Hamilton

Members-at-Large of the Council

1960–1963

Mason Hammond

Henry Alexander Laughlin

1961–1964

Frederick Scouller Allis, Jr.

Bernard Bailyn

1962–1965

Paul Herman Buck

Lyman Henry Butterfield

Resident Members

October 11, 1962

1916
Francis Apthorp Foster

1919
Fred Norris Robinson

1924
Clarence Saunders Brigham
Charles Howard McIlwain

1927
Kenneth Ballard Murdock
Arthur Meier Schlesinger
Roger Wolcott

1928
Claude Moore Fuess
Arthur Stanwood Pier

1929
Sidney Bradshaw Fay
Frank Washburn Grinnell

1930
Henry Wilder Foote
James Phinney Baxter, 3rd
Philip Putnam Chase

1932
Henry Latimer Seaver
Francis Parkman

1933
William Leonard Langer

1935
Henry Lee Shattuck
Milton Edward Lord

1937
Frederick Merk

1938
Leverett Saltonstall
Keyes DeWitt Metcalf
Roscoe Pound

1939
Clifford Kenyon Shipton

1940
Paul Herman Buck
Henry Rouse Viets

1941
Charles Moorfield Storey
Perry Miller
Walter Muir Whitehill

1942
Chauncey Cushing Nash

1943
William Alexander Jackson
Wilbur Kitchener Jordan

1944
Palfrey Perkins
Raymond Sanger Wilkins
Frederic Haines Curtiss

1945
John Adams
Arthur Harrison Cole
Ralph Lowell
Arthur Meier Schlesinger, Jr.
Mark DeWolfe Howe

1946
Carleton Rubira Richmond
Ernest Stanley Dodge

1947
George Norton Northrop
Robert Ephraim Peabody
Elliott Perkins
William Phillips
Austin Wakeman Scott
Frederic Winthrop
Henry Cabot Lodge

1948
Parkman Dexter Howe
Benjamin Joy
Arthur Stone Dewing
Robert Earle Moody

1949
Stephen Thomas Riley
Warren Gage Wheeler

1950
Archibald MacLeish
George Talbot Goodspeed
Michael Joseph Walsh

1951
Mark Bortman
Stephen Wheatland
Crane Brinton
Thomas James Wilson
William Henry Claflin
Richard Walden Hale, Jr.
John Silsbee Lawrence
Thomas Boylston Adams

1952
Augustus Peabody Loring
Bertram Kimball Little
Ellis Wethrell Brewster
Hugh Whitney
Davenport Brown
Charles Dyer Childs
Oscar Handlin
William Henry Harrison
Samuel Cabot
Edward Pierce Hamilton
George Caspar Homans
Godfrey Lowell Cabot
John Quincy Adams

1953
Henry Morse Channing

1954
Norman Burdett Nash
Nathan Marsh Pusey
Charles Jackson
Charles Edward Wyzanski, Jr.
James Barr Ames
Lyman Henry Butterfield
John Bryant Paine, Jr.

1955
David Britton Little
Elting Elmore Morison
Frederick Scouller Allis, Jr.
I. Bernard Cohen

1956
Sterling Dow
Henry Hornblower, II
Perry Townsend Rathbone
Gordon Thaxter Banks
David Thompson Watson McCord
Richard Cushing Paine
Charles Sumner Bird

1957
Thomas Emerson Proctor
William Bradford Osgood

1958
George Cheever Shattuck
James Lawrence, Jr.

Marion Vernon Brewington
Charles Hopkinson
Maurice Cary Blake
Richard Mott Gummere
Robert Dale Richardson
Bernard Bailyn
Malcolm Freiberg
Erwin Dain Canham
Abbott Lowell Cummings
Myron Piper Gilmore
Mason Hammond

1959

Howland Shaw Warren
Frank Burt Freidel, Jr.
Alden Porter Johnson
Paul Abraham Freund
George Kirkpatrick Whitney
Frederick Josiah Bradlee
John Otis Brew
Rudolph Ruzicka
Theodore Chase

1960

Francis Murray Forbes, Jr.
Samuel Edmund Thorne
Charles Francis Adams
Henry Alexander Laughlin
Benjamin Loring Young
George Peabody Gardner
Thomas Corwin Mendenhall
Walt Whitman Rostow
Douglas Wallace Bryant
Kenneth Schuyler Lynn

1961

Franklin Lewis Ford
Stephen Phillips
Philip Hofer
Henry Donaldson Jordan
C. Rodgers Burgin
John Daniel Cushing
John Fitzgerald Kennedy
William Lincoln Payson
James Jackson Minot

1962

Robert Lee Wolff
Lucien Price
Erwin Nathaniel Griswold
Wilbur Joseph Bender
Charles van Ravenswaay
Alexander Whiteside Williams
Lewis Frederick Perry

Corresponding Members

1928

Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker

1930

Joseph Clark Grew

1931

Allan Nevins

1935

Henry Sturgis Morgan

1936

Lawrence Counselman Wroth

1937

John Nicholas Brown

1938

Julian Parks Boyd
Charles Seymour
Thomas Winthrop Streeter
Winthrop Sargent, Jr.

1939
Samuel Flagg Bemis

1940
Henry Steele Commager
Robert William Glenroie Vail

1941
Bernhard Knollenberg
James Blaine Hedges

1942
Wallace Notestein

1943
Harold Stein Jantz

1944
William Gurdon Saltonstall

1945
Curtis Putnam Nettels
Leonard Woods Labaree
Robert Winthrop

1946
Ralph Henry Gabriel
Carl Bridenbaugh

1949
Richard LeBaron Bowen
Edmund Sears Morgan
Dexter Perkins

1951
Henry Francis du Pont
Edward Chase Kirkland
William Mitchell Van Winkle

1952
Walter Goodwin Davis
Francis Brown

1954
Kenneth Chorley
James Bryant Conant
Sir Denis William Brogan
Thompson Ritner Harlow
Lawrence Quincy Mumford
Roy Edward Larsen
Ernest Samuels
Theodore Sizer

1956
Clifton Waller Barrett
Louis Booker Wright
Vernon Dale Tate

1957
Lester Jesse Cappon
Arthur Burr Darling

1958
Andrew Oliver
E. Harold Hugo
Alfred A. Knopf
Richard William Leopold
Ray Nash

1959
Whitfield Jenks Bell, Jr.
George Lee Haskins
Merle Eugene Curti
Lawrence Henry Gipson
Francis Lewis Berkeley
Philip May Hamer
Raymond Phineas Stearns

1960
Ray Allen Billington
Ernest McNeill Eller
John Morton Blum
Richard Hofstadter
Sir Ronald Syme
David Herbert Donald
Nicholas Biddle Wainwright

1961
Sir Frank Chalton Francis
Milton Halsey Thomas
Marcus Falkner Cunliffe
Barnaby Conrad Keeney
Jacques Barzun
Sir Isaiah Berlin
John Melville Jennings
Comer Vann Woodward
Robert Roswell Palmer

1962
Joseph Raphael Frese
James Russell Wiggins
Arnold Whitridge
Wayne Clayton Grover
James Joseph Heslin
William Kaye Lamb
Merrill Monroe Jensen

Associate Members

1945
Dumas Malone

1947
Henry Knox Sherrill

1952
Frederick Lewis Weis

1961
Harold Bowditch
William Goodwin Renwick

1962
Henry Forbush Howe

Honorary Members

1943
Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill

1947
Sir Frederick Maurice Powicke
Arnold Joseph Toynbee

1951
George Peabody Gooch

1953
Sir Keith Grahame Feiling

1954
Sir Harold Nicolson

1956
Samuel Eliot Morison

1961
Waldo Gifford Leland

Changes in Membership

May 11–October 11, 1962

DEATHS

Resident Member

1916, Charles Edwards Park, September 23, 1962

Honorary Member

1929, George Macaulay Trevelyan,[1] July 21, 1962

[1] Elected a Corresponding Member, April 13, 1916, and an Honorary Member, November 14, 1929.

Papers

Ancient Rome and Modern America Reconsidered

Mason Hammond*

History and the contemporary scene interact in two directions. The first of these is eminently respectable and admired by historiographers and historians, as by Professors Woodward and Hughes in their articles in the *American Historical Review* for October, 1960.[1] This is the continuing reinterpretation of the past by new insights achieved by the present. Though the present discussion does not propose to dwell long on this type of interaction, brief note may be made of the way in which Roman history has been reinterpreted by successive generations of scholars since Edward Gibbon.

Gibbon, who published the six volumes of the first edition of his *Decline and Fall* between 1776 and 1788, presented on the whole the traditional account given by the ancient literary sources and availed himself only incidentally of such non-literary sources as coins and inscriptions. His contributions, apart from his learning and his style, were two. As Professor Momigliano has remarked,[2] he sought to combine erudition with the philosophic approach to history which had developed during the eighteenth century. And, as is well-known, he interpreted certain phases of his subject, notably the history of the Church, in terms of eighteenth-century enlightened rationalism.

Early in the following century, the analytical approach which Friedrich August Wolf had applied to Homer in his famous *Prolegomena* (1795) was extended to the criticism of the sources for early Roman history, notably by Barthold G. Niebuhr, who published the

* This paper was read at the April, 1961, meeting. Most of the works cited in the text need no further bibliographical indications; they are either familiar or can be readily located. For most, also, only the date of first publication is given, with only occasional indications of later editions.

[1] C. Vann Woodward, "The Age of Reinterpretation," and H. Stuart Hughes, "The Historian and the Social Scientist," *American Historical Review*, LXVI (1960), 1–19, and 20–46; both were papers delivered at the annual meeting of the American Historical Society in December, 1959.

[2] Arnaldo Momigliano, "Gibbon's Contribution to Historical Method," *Historia*, II (1954), 450–463, reprinted in his *Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, No. 47 (Rome, 1955), pp. 195–211.

first two volumes of his *Römische Geschichte* in 1811–1812. Niebuhr's scepticism prevailed through the nineteenth century, but in the present century there has been a reaction toward acceptance of the general outline of early Roman history. Nevertheless the critical attitude of the nineteenth century led to great advances in the analysis and evaluation of the source material.

During the nineteenth century, also, the comparative study of history resulted from a widening familiarity with countries outside of Europe, and particularly with primitive societies. In religion, Fustel de Coulanges' *La Cité Antique* (1864) and Sir James G. Frazer's monumental *The Golden Bough* (first published in 1890) represented the application of comparative methods to classical studies, as in law did Sir Henry Maine's *Ancient Law* (1861), to mention only three well-known works.

The outstanding modern historian of Rome, Theodor Mommsen, wrote his early *Römische Geschichte* (1854–1856) as a liberal, eager to see Germany progress from backward-looking disunion to modern unification; in consequence he valued Caesar, iconoclast and creator, against the traditionalist Cicero. His later work, notably his *Römisches Staatsrecht* (1871–1888), was inspired by the concern of the mid-nineteenth century with legal and constitutional problems. Mommsen also applied to Roman history his wide knowledge of, and skill in, the new non-literary historical sciences of numismatics and epigraphy.

By the end of the nineteenth century, social and economic problems more insistently demanded recognition in historical studies. Among those who approached Roman history with these fresh insights were Professor Tenney Frank, in his *Economic History of Rome* (1920, revised 1927) and in his contributions to the *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* (1933–1940), and particularly Michael Rostovtzeff in his *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (1926) and *of the Hellenistic World* (1941), perhaps the most significant works in the field since Mommsen's *Staatsrecht*.

Finally, the experience of the last half-century has shown that political events are determined not only by constitutional, economic, or social considerations but by deep psychological emotions, on which the skillful political leader capitalizes for good or for ill. Recent Roman historians, like Sir Ronald Syme in his *Roman Revolution* (1939), have analyzed maneuvers of individuals or family groups for political

control of the senate or assemblies. Others, such as Michael Grant in his *From Imperium to Auctoritas* (1946), have studied the propaganda by which, over and beyond either their legal powers or their practical command of force and finances, Augustus and his successors established themselves in the popular imagination. Thus each generation has brought to the reinterpretation of the Roman past fruitful insights derived from the experience of its own present.

The second interaction, that of history on the present, is much more questionable. Indeed, the historian himself, whether professional or (in the best sense) amateur, probably feels that history should concern itself with interpreting and expounding the past and should not attempt to influence the present. Yet even the most resolute disciple of Ranke may occasionally hope that if the present can understand how the past really happened, it will be better able to shape the future. Certainly ancient historians openly professed to offer the lessons of the past to their contemporaries—from Thucydides, who stated that he would be satisfied if those would judge his work useful who might desire to examine clearly what had happened and thereby envisage what was, in the nature of mankind, likely to come to pass in the same or similar fashion (I 22.4); to Livy, who said that the most profitable aspect of historical study is to examine outstanding instances of every type of action and to select therefrom what could be imitated either for oneself or for one's community, or avoided as disgraceful either in its inception or in its outcome (Pref. 10).

As Spengler and Toynbee realized, classical civilization generally and Roman history in particular afford an especially apt source of historical analogies because they present a well-documented and completed cycle whose character is not entirely alien from the present. The lecturer on Roman history is therefore exposed to frequent questions from students and friends about the relevance of his subject to the present. The respectable and sage reply is either "no comment" or "differences as great as similarities render any parallel fallacious." This paper has been prepared to document more specifically such a reply and to clarify at least the author's own views on whether the ancient or the modern concept of the function of history is the sounder. The title is taken from a book by Guglielmo Ferrero, fifty years ago a historian much read on the end of the Roman republic and the beginning of the empire, though now less well-known. After several trips

to South and to North America, Ferrero published in 1914 his *Ancient Rome and Modern America*, the thesis of which was one still familiar, that in both Rome and the modern Western Hemisphere quality has been sacrificed to quantity. His was only one of many books in which some analogy is drawn between Rome and the present. For instance, in 1910 the Earl of Cromer, comparing the Roman Empire and British rule in India in his *Ancient and Modern Imperialism*, concluded that, whatever the British might do to liberalize their rule, it should be clearly understood that they had not the smallest intention of abandoning their empire and that it was highly improbable that any such intention would be entertained by their posterity. A scant half-century has proved him woefully wrong, as it has Churchill, who stated that he did not intend to preside over the dissolution of the British Empire.

In 1939, the then editor of the *Kansas City Star*, Henry J. Haskell, published his *New Deal in Old Rome*. Although in the preface he denied that he was critical of the New Deal, in fact he drew material from a long sweep of Roman history to show that socialistic measures had ultimately caused Rome's downfall. It seems hardly sound historically to compare a political program of less than ten years with measures scattered in Roman history from the conflicts of the plebs and patricians in the fifth century B.C. to the state socialism of the fourth century A.D. Again, in 1943, there appeared a posthumous book by the distinguished American historian Frank B. Marsh. Under the title *Modern Problems in the Ancient World*, he studied various problems which seemed to him common to the ancient and modern societies, such as land bonuses for veterans or the corrupt politics of the later Roman republic, and concluded that in antiquity constitutional government had broken down through failure properly to solve these difficulties and that the present might well take cognizance of this failure.

These examples, which could be multiplied, suggest the two fundamental weaknesses in drawing analogies between the past and the present. First, it is unsound to draw materials from various moments of the past to compare with the single moment of the present. And second, the statesman can always reply to the historian's warnings (because the lessons drawn from the past are almost always warnings) that "things are different now," as indeed they are. To illustrate these two weaknesses, this paper will consider five moments in Roman history which offer tempting similarities to the American present

and suggest the differences which render such parallels deceptive.

During the fourth and third centuries B.C., Rome had made herself mistress of Italy and, in two exhausting wars against Carthage, had secured control of the western Mediterranean. It is not too fanciful to liken her position in 200 B.C. to that of the United States at the opening of this century, when, after the trial of the Civil War, she was proud mistress of more than half of North America and the leading nation of the Western Hemisphere. During the first half of the second century B.C., three major wars in Greece and Asia Minor made Rome dominant also in the eastern Mediterranean and at the same time faced her with the dilemma of world power. What Tenney Frank, in his *Roman Imperialism* (1914), called "sentimental politics" (chap. viii) had failed to keep the Hellenistic states, whom Rome respected as the representatives of Hellenic culture, in any sort of political good behavior. A new generation of political opportunists and financial entrepreneurs was advocating tougher measures to protect Rome's interests, and was seeking opportunities for self-aggrandizement or self-enrichment from Rome's overseas ventures. More enlightened and patriotic leaders were divided between isolationists, led by Cato the Elder, and expansionist internationalists, represented by the Scipios.

In the United States today, the sentimental foreign policies of the first World War and the League of Nations have been replaced by a tougher and more disillusioned approach. Our extensive overseas operations have not been free from self-seeking and inefficiency. In discussions of foreign policy, isolationists are still aligned against internationalists. Respect for national self-determination is increasingly difficult to maintain in the face of threats to our security and the temptation towards intervention.

However, at least two major differences exist between Rome in 150 B.C. and the United States in 1960 A.D. First, representative federalism today offers for international rivalries an alternative solution to imperialistic dominance by a single power. Second, on the contemporary international stage strut two contenders for domination, and it would, at least in hindsight, be foolish to equate Antiochus the Great of Syria in the 190's B.C. or Parthia in the 150's as rivals to Rome with Russia as a rival to the United States. Indeed, were this paper being given in Moscow, a case could be made for comparing

Russia today with Rome of the second century B.C. and for regarding the United States merely as at once the largest and the weakest of the western powers, just as Seleucid Syria was of the Hellenistic states.

It required a century for Rome to solve the dilemma which she faced in 150 B.C. During this century, the tensions between city-state and world-state brought the Republic to an end.[3] Most scholars trace the *Failure of the Roman Republic*, as Professor Richard E. Smith entitled his essay (1955) on the topic, to the tribunates of Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus in 133 and 123–122 B.C. Professor C. A. Robinson, Jr., writing in the *Saturday Review* for 1953, described "Rome's Last Chance" to save classical culture as that offered by the Gracchi.[4] Rome's failure to change from an oligarchic to a democratic government condemned the Republic and thereby created the slow decline under the Empire. As will appear, it may be questioned whether the Gracchi either wished or conceived a democracy in any modern sense. Rostovtzeff began his *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* with the Gracchi. Although Sir Ronald Syme's *Roman Revolution* starts chronologically with 70 B.C., it traces the conflict between conservatives and radicals back into the second century. Thus the second Roman moment of comparison may fairly be taken as that of the Gracchi. Rome's expansion had converted the city itself from a small agricultural community, without extremes of wealth or poverty, to a great metropolis with all the consequent problems of overpopulation, food supply, public security, and, more fundamentally, a wide separation of the rich from the poor and vast opportunities for political jobbery and corruption. Indeed, it was no longer possible to operate either the Roman metropolis or her empire with a town-meeting form of government designed for an agricultural village. Added to these internal problems were those more directly created by empire: how to control remote generals and armies, how to treat allies and provinces, what to do with veterans, and the like.

The parallel between the city of Rome transformed from city-state to imperial capital and the United States transformed from agricultural to industrial nation is perhaps more farfetched than that be-

[3] Mason Hammond, *City-State and World-State in Greek and Roman Political Theory until Augustus* (Cambridge, 1951).

[4] Charles Alexander Robinson, Jr., "Rome's Last Chance," *Saturday Review*, March 21, 1953, pp. 8–9, 45–46.

tween the two as they emerged as world powers. Yet analogies may be drawn with the urbanization of society today, with the problems of poor relief and employment, with the great separation of rich and poor, and most aptly with the difficulty of running a modern unified industrial nation with a government designed for a fragmented and agricultural group of federated states.

Nevertheless, there is at least one fundamental difference between the program of the Gracchi and the New Deal. Whatever is thought of the motives of the Gracchi, they dealt only with superficial aspects of the problem which faced the Roman state; that is, with land distribution, grain supply, provincial misgovernment, and the like. Both they and their opponents were blind to the fundamental tension, that between the city-state constitution and the government of an empire. Whatever, in turn, is thought of the New Deal, it seems clear that it has been on the whole successful and that the United States is committed to increasing socialization.

Moreover, the adaptation of a constitution shaped for the needs of the 1780's to those of the 1960's is far more feasible than was that of the Roman republican constitution to the needs of empire, not merely because of such practical differences as modern rapidity of communication and transport, but because today federalism and representation enable widely scattered individual citizens to take an indirect part in national politics, whereas the Roman could only do so directly, that is by appearing in Rome to vote in person.

This leads to the third moment of comparison. The dilemma of world power presented to Rome in the early second century B.C. was finally solved in terms of imperialistic conquest, notably by Pompey in the East during the sixties, but also on all fronts, culminating in Caesar's conquest of Gaul during the fifties. The final unification of the Mediterranean in the control of Rome had meant several generations of war, devastation, unsettlement, corrupt government, proscriptions, and general economic and social upheaval. The population of the then world longed for peace. At the same time, the inadequacy of the Republican government, first highlighted by the Gracchi, had become increasingly apparent; the state was a rotting carcass torn apart by competing factions and ambitious individuals, who either resorted to gangster tactics in Rome itself or marched from without upon her at the head of armies.

Thus the concomitant of the desire for peace was the need for a strong central government able to maintain that peace. Whether Caesar planned, as Mommsen thought, to achieve this by sweeping away the outmoded institutions of the Republic and creating a Hellenistic monarchy, or whether he was only the most forceful of the Republican bosses, who sought personal dominance without a long-range program, as Ferrero argued, is for the present purpose an unimportant question, since before he could realize whatever intentions he had, he fell a victim to deep-seated prejudices in favor of the traditional Republic.

The third moment is therefore that at which control of the Mediterranean was achieved by Augustus at the Battle of Actium in 31 B.C. His victory was made possible by the support of Italy and the western provinces in reaction against the attempt of Antony and Cleopatra to impose Hellenistic monarchy as the government of the world-state. Augustus had to compromise between the need for centralized government and the widespread emotional conviction that the Roman republican government represented liberty as against tyranny, monarchy, or dictatorship. Though, as Professor Larsen has shown,[5] the Hellenistic world had successfully practiced representative federalism, it had produced no theoretical examination which would make this acceptable as a substitute for the city-state, so brilliantly idealized by Plato and Aristotle. Essentially, therefore, Augustus, in restoring the Republic, had to preserve the form of the city-state by sacrificing the concept of citizenship as participation in government for that of citizenship as membership in a ruling power. He vested the traditional functions of the Senate and Roman People in the senate, preserving merely a token participation by the assemblies. Moreover, since the only recognized government for empire was a monarchy, he disguised his personal control as that of an agent empowered by the Roman state to perform various functions of government on its behalf.

Again, it is immaterial to this discussion whether Augustus was a sincere traditionalist in this compromise between the Restored Republic and *Princeps* or whether in fact, by holding in his own hands the sinews of power, particularly troops and cash, and by indicating strongly that his position should be hereditary, he was hypocritically con-

[5] Jacob A. O. Larsen, *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History*, Sather Classical Lectures, XXVIII (Berkeley, 1955).

cealing monarchy under the cloak of republicanism. The success of his principate is attested both by two centuries of outward peace and prosperity and by the fact that though the government of the empire became, not merely because of the personalities of his successors but principally through the inevitable pressures upon it, first a monarchy and finally an autocracy, nevertheless later generations ostensibly sought to perpetuate what he had created.

The modern world, like the Mediterranean world of the first century B.C., faces a choice between self-annihilation, if not by atomic warfare, by fragmentation and strife, or of unification and peace. Indeed, the roles of Antony as protagonist of Hellenistic monarchy and Octavian as champion of the Greco-Roman city-state offer a parallel to those of Russia standing for the eastern monolithic personal state and the United States advocating the western ideals of liberty and democracy. Today as in 30 B.C., the obvious, though discouraging, prospect of solution would seem to be the triumph of one or the other. But the present offers an alternative which, as has been indicated, was inconceivable for the contemporaries of Augustus, namely the extension to international affairs of the concepts of representation and federalism, already not only proved in practice at the national level but accepted in theory by widespread sectors of opinion throughout the modern world.

Gibbon hailed the period which elapsed from the death of Domitian to the accession of Commodus as that during which the condition of the human race was most happy and prosperous. But modern research has come to recognize behind this façade signs which, unnoticed at the time, gave warning of catastrophe to come. Offensive wars and the increasing pressure of barbarians on all frontiers overtaxed the resources of the empire in men and money, resources which Augustus had regarded as barely sufficient for the minimum needs of cautious defense. The expenses of government rose steadily as both salaries and personnel increased, with the result that ever heavier taxation was imposed on an economy in which already the margin between profit and loss was very narrow. Charitable investments declined in value to the point that income no longer sufficed for their purposes. Municipalities so overextended themselves in ostentatious and wasteful expenses that the central government had to intervene. The economic development of the provinces led to a decentralization of agricultural and industrial

production, with a consequent reduction in trade and a decline, relatively if not absolutely, of the older prosperous centers. Loss of confidence in the traditional religions turned the lower classes to more emotional and mystical beliefs in the vain search for otherworldly succor against the increasingly complex and oppressive life of the actual world. In particular, both popular belief and official propaganda endowed the emperor with a supernatural aura and with outward pomp, in order to strengthen confidence in his ability to cope successfully with the problems confronting the empire.

Perhaps the most serious weakness, however, was one inherent in classical culture, namely self-satisfaction with things as they were. The old formulas in literature and art lost any inner content as attention was increasingly paid solely to the externals of expression and polish. The well-to-do regarded as eminently satisfactory an economic and social order which maintained them in control and in comfort, however much the condition of the productive workers was deteriorating. No voice was raised against the prevailing euphoria except that of the Christians, and theirs was not a social or economic protest but a moral and religious one.

These symptoms of stagnation present in Roman society at the fourth moment selected for comparison, the death of Marcus Aurelius in 180 A.D., can be paralleled in modern America. A permanent national debt, the legacy of two world wars and a depression, is now regarded as an element of strength in the economy. The costs of government at all levels and of defense rise at an astronomical rate. Municipal finances are often unsound. The development of formerly backward areas within the United States and of underdeveloped countries elsewhere has meant a loss of prosperity in older centers. Great wealth separates a small sector of society from the masses. Traditional patterns of belief and of culture are breaking down. Political leaders are presented to the public as more wise and capable than ordinary men. Beneficiaries of the capitalistic system of private enterprise view with alarm the concept of an "Affluent Society" with greater public control or a wider distribution of profits.

Since, however, the modern economic system differs fundamentally from the ancient, these signs do not necessarily point toward catastrophe. The Roman empire depended on a cash economy, and could not increase the limited amount of available metal except by depreciating

the coinage. The modern system of credit, freed from cash limitations, can be expanded indefinitely to meet new needs and expenses so long as it commands public confidence. Despite what is said about industry, commerce, and finance in the Roman empire, agriculture remained the basic occupation of the bulk of the population and the cornerstone of the economy. Nor was there during the classical period any fundamental revolution in methods of production, whether agricultural or industrial, but only their extension from the Mediterranean centers to the peripheral areas. Today, on the contrary, the industrial revolution and extraordinary advances in natural sciences have greatly reduced the part played by agriculture in our economy and suggest that manpower no longer withholds production from indefinite expansion. Despite the American aristocracy of wealth, few would maintain that in this country today industrial or agricultural workers are generally in a deteriorating economic position. Conservatism is far from being the accepted point of view, whether in politics, in the arts, or in science. Hence it would be hazardous to argue that resemblances between Antonine Rome and contemporary United States give warning of economic weakness and an approaching catastrophe like that of the third century A.D. Catastrophe, atomic or other, may come, but from political or emotional tensions, not from economic or cultural stagnation.

The catastrophe which overtook classical culture was not the slow decay of the fifth and sixth centuries but the widespread breakdown of government and society which, held at bay between Commodus and the early third century, occurred with startling swiftness on the murder of Severus Alexander in 235 A.D. and prevailed until the reunification of imperial power by Diocletian in 285 A.D. A standing puzzle in Roman history is to explain why the Mediterranean world recovered so rapidly under Augustus from the half century of confusion through which it had passed before Actium but failed to do so after the restoration by Diocletian. At least a possible answer is that in the time of Augustus classical culture and society still had enough vitality to stage a comeback, but by the early third century they were not merely stagnant but exhausted. Charles N. Cochrane, in his *Christianity and Classical Culture* (1940), effectively documented the thesis that the third century A.D. marks the real watershed between the classical and the Christian mediaeval or Byzantine mind. Thus English scholars are justified in beginning mediaeval and Byzantine history

with Constantine. Naturally, since few historical transitions are abrupt, many elements of classical civilization survived into the fourth and fifth centuries and even later. Indeed, Diocletian and Constantine thought that they were restoring and strengthening the old Augustan empire. The concept of this universal empire continued to dominate the mediaeval and Byzantine mind until the emergence of modern sovereign and independent national states.

However sincerely Diocletian and Constantine believed that they were renovating the past, they did in fact establish, or rather they perfected, a new concept of the state and of society, one in which authority stemmed down from an emperor who derived it not from specific grants by the Senate and Roman people, as had Augustus, or from the implied consent of all citizens, as had the Antonines, but from "the grace of God." The classical city-state had been conceived as a framework for the self-realization of the individual, so that the Romans, as Professor Wirszubski has shown,[6] could identify *libertas* with *ciuitas*. When Caracalla in 212 A.D. extended citizenship to practically all the inhabitants of the empire, a process was completed which had begun in the second century B.C., which had been vastly expedited by the grant of citizenship to the Italian allies in 90 and 89 B.C., and which had continued when citizenship spread to the provinces during the empire; namely the loss of any political content for citizenship. Thus the later Roman empire regarded the individual no longer as a political entity but as a mere cog in the imperial machine. There is no need to elaborate here on the burdens of taxation, on the difficulties of securing adequate manpower both for the necessary agricultural labor and for the armies, or on the consequent regimentation of every individual into his occupation. Sir Samuel Dill has given a classic description of these characteristics of the later Empire in the third book of his *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire* (1898, revised 1899).

The monolithic state of Diocletian and Constantine affords a fifth and final Roman moment which, despite the gloomy prognostications

[6] Chaim Wirszubski, *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome during the late Republic and Early Principate*, Cambridge Classical Studies (Cambridge, England, 1950); Italian translation by Giosue Musca, *Libertas: il concetto politico di Liberta a Roma tra Repubblica e Impero*, Biblioteca di Cultura Moderna, 518 (Bari, Laterza, 1957), with an appendix at pp. 257–285 by Arnaldo Momigliano, translated from a review in the *Journal of Roman Studies*, XLI (1951), 146–153.

of contemporary conservatives, presents only superficial analogies to modern America. This country has not yet passed through a political, cultural, and spiritual crisis corresponding to that of the third century. Though the modern state is assuming more and more social responsibility and imposing more and more controls upon the individual, regimentation is still far from that of the later empire. Indeed, if again, this paper were being presented in Moscow, it would be much easier to draw a parallel between the Byzantine and Soviet concepts of the state and even to argue that Moscow is the ultimate heir of Constantinople. Even for Russia, however, what evidence is available suggests that economic conditions are improving not only in general but for the individual, and that controls are being relaxed rather than stiffened; that is, that in Russia the individual is receiving more, not less, recognition.

In conclusion, the five critical moments of ancient Rome which have been selected in this paper for comparison with the present critical—if critical it be—moment of modern America do present certain analogies, but also great differences. Rome of the second century B.C. and the United States today face without adequate preparation the responsibilities of world dominance and the dilemma of how to reconcile recognition of the sovereignty of other states with national security. Rome moved toward imperialistic control; the United States still can hope for a co-operative and federal solution through the United Nations. Both societies had to reconcile a basic shift in economic and social patterns with a traditional form of government. The Gracchi failed; the New Deal has had measurable success so far as can now be judged. The need for unity and peace to prevent disintegration and disaster faces the world today as it did that of the first century B.C. The Augustan solution was to compromise between the traditional city-state, as represented by the Senate and Roman People, and the efficiency of a monarchical administration of the world-state. The weakness inherent in this solution, namely that no effective communication existed between the government and the governed, need not recur in the one world of tomorrow, with the rapidity of modern communications and with the general recognition today that representation and federalism make possible participation in government by widely scattered individuals. Beneath the self-confident surface of American society may lie trends and tensions such as can be detected

behind the outwardly happy and prosperous façade of the Antonine period. But a vastly freer economic system, the possibilities of technological and scientific advances, and a general dissatisfaction with things as they are afford good prospects that progress rather than stagnation is the order of tomorrow. Finally, although the complexities of modern society have rendered necessary a development of state socialism and control undreamed of by our Founding Fathers, modern America is still a long way from the later Roman empire, while even Russia seems to be moving away from rather than toward monolithic regimentation.

If then this brief examination has supported the lecturer on Roman history in his negative reply to the student eager to find lessons for the present such as Thucydides and Livy promised, should the historian therefore conclude that his only task is better to explain the past? If so, and if understanding means the power to control, the historian may at least claim to help the statesman to comprehend the present by elucidating its roots in the past, even if he can offer no help from past analogies to suggest for present problems solutions which will have future success. Moreover there remains for the historian the insistent query whether he can or should do more. Granted that in every historical analogy, such as the five which have been so briefly and sweepingly sketched here, there are differences which render any precise parallel deceptive, nevertheless the fundamental historical datum remains the same: mankind itself.

If the physiologist, the psychologist, or the sociologist can establish certain broad directions or limits in which prophecy about the body, mind, or behavior may be valid, should not the historian also be able to establish some broad directions or limits within which the past indicates that the future may lie? Efforts to establish such generalizations from Roman history have indeed often been made. Rostovtzeff, for instance, found that its lesson was that the attempt to spread culture widely simply dilutes it, that leveling up becomes leveling down. Spengler and Toynbee based primarily on classical civilization their conclusion that all cultures follow an inevitable cycle of growth, floruit, and decay. The validity of such generalizations has seldom if ever commanded wide recognition. Nevertheless future historians will presumably not be discouraged from proposing others.

If, therefore, one who has spent his professional life in the study of

the classics may be permitted to hazard his, it would be that, as has already been suggested, the lesson of classical civilization and particularly of its decay under the Roman empire is the danger of excessive devotion to tradition and too rigid adherence to the established way of doing things. This not to say either that the classical, like any other cultural, achievement has no enduring value for the future or that new lamps are always to be accepted in exchange for old. But unless the past is taken off its pedestal and used to fructify the present, it becomes a sterile museum piece, and its dead weight may become so oppressive that the future reaction against it will blow it to dust, good along with bad. The great cultures of Mesopotamia and Egypt entered but little into the civilization of western Europe because by the time that the Greeks came in contact with them they were spent; it is easy to forget in admiration for the heritage of Greece and Rome how nearly this was either swept away by the barbarians or stultified by Byzantium, and indeed how much has been lost compared to what has survived. It should be a matter for wonder and gratitude that even after the crisis of the third century, classical culture retained enough vitality to impose itself on the barbarians and to be preserved by the Byzantines so that the new life of the Renaissance could not merely perpetuate it but build upon it. What the classical past has contributed to the western present and will continue to give to our future is not imitation but inspiration.

Father Abbey's Will

George T. Goodspeed*

As the distinguished authority on the psychology of adolescence, G. Stanley Hall, remarked many years ago, "A marked form of academic relaxation may be designated as nonsense or rather anti-sense."[1] An early example of this kind of collegiate recreation and the story of its publication form the subject of this essay.

A century ago, when John Langdon Sibley was gathering material for his *Harvard Graduates*, he published an account of the Reverend John Seccomb, author of *Father Abbey's Will*, and of Matthew Abdy, the college sweeper and bottle washer whose death inspired the doggerel stanzas which have made both of them immortal.

"Till the present generation," wrote Sibley, "portions of . . . [the *Will*] have been familiar to nearly all the good housewives of New England, and we 'old folks' remember the interest with which we listened to our mothers' recital of the witty rhymes."[2]

The rhymes are no longer familiar, nor would we today call them witty, but they have antiquarian interest; and the circumstances under which they became perpetuated may be worth recounting. How soon after Abdy's death John Seccomb composed his mock will we do not know, but it first appeared in print in the *Weekly Rehearsal* in January, 1732.[3] The *Rehearsal* was a literary newspaper edited for the first year of its short life by Jeremiah Gridley, at this time an assistant at the South Grammar School in Boston.[4] During Gridley's editorship the paper's style was modeled on that of Addison and Steele and the other essayists of the age of Queen Anne. The young schoolteacher followed his English originals so successfully that students of later

* This paper was read at the March, 1961, meeting.

[1] G. Stanley Hall, "Student Customs," American Antiquarian Society, *Proceedings*, New Ser., XIV (1900–01), 87.

[2] *Father Abbey's Will; to Which is Added a Letter of Courtship to his Virtuous and Amiable Widow. With Historical and Biographical Notes*, ed. John L. Sibley (Cambridge, 1854), p. 8.

[3] *Weekly Rehearsal*, Jan. 3, 1732.

[4] Clifford K. Shipton, *Biographical Sketches of Those who Attended Harvard College in the Classes 1722–1725, with Bibliographical and Other Notes*, VII (Boston, 1945), p. 519.

years have been unable to determine which of his essays were original and which reprints from abroad.[5]

In the issue of the *Rehearsal* for January 3, 1732, there appeared this item: "On Saturday Night last, The LION King of Beasts, died at the Tan-yard in Water-Street, Boston, where his Body may be viewed." If the juxtaposition of this bit of intelligence with what appeared immediately below it was fortuitous, it was not wholly inappropriate.

Cambridge, Decemb. 1731.

Some time since died here Mr. *Matth.* A——y, in a very advanc'd Age, he had for a great Number of Years served the College here, in Quality of Bed maker and Sweeper, Having left no Child, his Wife inherits his whole Estate which he bequeathed to her by his last Will and Testament as follows,

1.

To my dear Wife,
My Joy and Life,
I freely now do give her
My whole Estate,
With all my Plate
Being just about to leave her.

2.

A Tub of Soap,
A long Cart Rope,
A Frying Pan & Kettle,
An Ashes Pail,
A threshing Flail,
An iron Wedge & Beetle.

3.

Two painted Chairs,
Nine Warden Pairs,
A large old dripping Platter,
The Bed of Hay
On which I lay,
An old Sauce Pan for Butter.

[5] Joseph T. Buckingham, *Specimens of Newspaper Literature*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1850), I, 115.

4.

A little Mugg,
A two Quart Jugg,
A Bottle full of Brandy,
A Looking Glass
To see your Face
You'l find it very handy.

5.

A Musket true
As ever flew,
A pound of Shot and Wallett
A Leather Sash
My Calabash
My Powder Horn & Bullet.

6.

An Old Sword Blade,
A Garden Spade
A Ho, a Rake, a Ladder,
A wooden Cann,
A Close Stool Pan,
A Clyster Pipe and Bladder.

7.

A greazy Hat,
My old Ram Cat,
A yard & half of Linnen,
A Pot of Grease,
A woollen Fleece,
In order for your spinning.

8.

A small Tooth Comb,
An ashen Broom,
A Candlestick & Hatchet,
A Coverlid
Strip'd down with Red,
A Bagg of Rags to patch it.

9.

A ragged Mat,
A Tub of Fat,
A Book put out by *Bunnian,*
Another Book
By *Robin Rook,*
A Skain or two of Spunyarn.

10.

An old black Muff,
Some Garden Stuff,
A Quantity of Burrage,
Some Devil's Weed
And Burdock Seed
To season well your Porridge.

11.

A Chafing Dish
With one Salt Fish,
If I am not mistaken,
A Leg of Pork,
A broken Fork
A half a Flitch of Bacon.

12.

A spinning Wheel,
One Peck of Meal,
A Knife without a handle,
A rusty Lamp,
Two Quarts of Samp,
And half a Tallow Candle.

13.

My Pouch and Pipes,
Two Oxen Tripes,
An oaken Dish well carved,
My little Dog,
And spotted Hog,
With two young Pigs just starv'd.

14.

This is my Store
I have no more,
I heartily do give it,
My Years are spun
My Days are done,
And so I think to leave it.

Five weeks later, in the issue for February 7, there appeared a sequel.

New Haven, January 24.

To the Author of the Rehearsal.

SIR,

Our Sweeper having lately buryed his Spouse, and accidentally hearing the Death and Will of his deceas'd *Cambridge Brother*, has conceiv'd a violent Passion for the Relict. As Love softens the Mind, and disposes to Poetry, he has eas'd himself in the following Strains, which he transmits to the charming Widow, as the first Essay of his Courtship.

1.

Mistress *A——y*,
To you I fly,
You only can relieve me,
To you I turn, for you I burn,
If you will but believe me.

2.

Then gentle Dame
Admit my Flame,
And grant me my Petition,
If you deny
Alas! I die
In pitiful Condition.

3.

Before the News
Of your poor Spouse
Had reach'd us at *New Haven*,

My dear Wife dy'd
Who was my Bride
In *Anno* Eighty *seven.*

4.

Thus being free
Let's both agree
To join our Hands for I do
Boldly aver
A Widower
Is fittest for a Widow.

5.

You may be sure
'Tis not your Dower
I make this flowing Verse on;
In these smooth lays
I only praise
The glories of your Person.

6.

For the whole that
Was left by *Mat.*
Fortune to me has granted
In equal Store,
Nay I've too more,
What *Matthew* always wanted:

7.

No Teeth, 'tis true
You have to shew,
The young think Teeth inviting,
But silly Youths!
I love those Mouths
Where there's no fear of biting.

8.

A leaky Eye
That's never dry
These woful Times is fitting,

A wrinkled Face
Adds solemn Grace
To Folks devout at Meeting.

9.

Thus to go on
I would Pen down
Your Charms from Head to Foot
Set all your Glory
In Verse before ye
But I've no Mind to do't.

10.

Then hast away
And make no Stay,
For soon as you come hither,
We'll eat and sleep,
Make Beds and sweep,
And talk and smoke together.

11.

But if my Dear,
I must move there
Towards *Cambridge* streight I'll set me
To towze the Hay
On which you lay,
If Madam you will let me.

Although the verses appeared anonymously they were generally known to have been written by John Seccomb of the class of 1728, who had turned out a number of humorous compositions in verse.[6] Among these was a mock-heroic on the fate of a stolen goose roasted at Deacon Hastings', the manuscript of which, incorporated in a letter to his classmate Thaddeus Mason, was in existence as late as 1794.[7] It has not been traced since that time.

In 1732 Mason was secretary to Governor Belcher, whose son

[6] *Belcher Papers*, Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections*, 6th Ser., VI–VII (1893–94), I, 105*n*.

[7] *Massachusetts Magazine*, VII (1795), 301–302.

Jonathan, Jr., was also a member of the class of 1728.[8] When *Father Abbey's Will* appeared in the *Rehearsal,* Jonathan was in England where, as a resident of the Middle Temple, he was studying for the bar.[9] He was the governor's favorite son, and the letters he received from home were numerous and affectionate.[10] Not only was the governor fond of Jonathan, he was ambitious for him, and since the young man's studies were expensive, he was concerned lest the money invested in them be wasted. There is more than a hint of Chesterfield in the correspondence. There are frequent references to consignments of gifts with which the young Templar was to curry favor for himself and his father with influential politicians, both lay and clerical, in the old country. Among these gifts were some "mapps & prospects of Boston," one of each for the Duke of Argyll, Lord Ilay, Lord Wilmington and Thomas Hollis.[11] The maps, presumably, were copies of the now famous Bonner plan of Boston, of which the third state, newly incorporating an elaborate cartouche with dedication to Governor Belcher, had recently been issued. No copy of this state is now known to survive, but Lawrence Wroth has conclusively established its existence,[12] and perhaps some day a copy will be found in the archives at Inverary Castle. The "Prospect" was probably the engraving of the "Northeast View of the Great Town of Boston" of which the copy in the Essex Institute seems to be the only surviving example. In November, 1731, there had been dispatched, along with Jonathan's diploma and two pairs of wild geese each for the Duke of Newcastle and Horace Walpole the elder, "4 cutts of the Colleges."[13] These last were doubtless impressions of William Burgis' *A Prospect of the Colledges at Cambridge in New England.* Of the first state of this print, issued, with its dedication to Governor Dummer, in 1726, only the copy belonging to this Society is known to survive. This engraving was reissued in 1743 with a dedication to Spencer Phips who had become lieutenant governor almost a decade earlier. A copy of the 1743 state is also to be seen in the Society's collections.

[8] Shipton, *Biographical Sketches . . . 1726–1730,* VIII (Boston, 1951), 449.

[9] *Ibid.,* VIII, 344.

[10] *Belcher Papers,* I, II, *passim.*

[11] *Ibid.,* I, 204.

[12] John Carter Brown Library, *Report to the Corporation of Brown University, July 1, 1947* (Providence, 1947), pp. 5–11.

[13] *Belcher Papers,* I, 35.

It is interesting to speculate whether the "4 cutts" could have been part of an intermediate edition, now lost entirely, with dedication to Belcher. But whereas Dummer and Phips both held office as lieutenant governor, Belcher served as governor in his own right, and the words "Lieutenant Governor" in the dedicatory cartouche do not appear to have been disturbed between the first and final states.

I return to my theme. On February 23, 1732, a fortnight after the letter of courtship by the New Haven Sweeper had made its appearance in the *Rehearsal,* Governor Belcher wrote to his son: "I send the two Rehearsals for the sake of the Sweeper's Will &c, wrote (they say) by your classmate Seccomb, & perhaps may bear reading in a London Coffe House."[14] His principal authority for this attribution was doubtless his secretary Thaddeus Mason, Seccomb's friend and classmate, described by the governor as "a worthy young man," to whom Jonathan was instructed to write a letter "with some prints."[15]

Belcher seems to have been well aware of the important part which coffeehouses could play in furthering the career of a young man in London. His letters include several references to them. "Some people have flurted as if you spent too much of your time at the N. England Coffe House. The Temple Coffe House, Dick's, or the Rainbow wou'd be much more to your advantage."[16] And again, "At Tom's Coffe House you have polite company, but at the New England ordinary."[17] Dicks, at No. 8 Fleet Street, was a favorite gathering place for young Templars.[18] Perhaps at Dick's there was a box where contributions to the *Gentleman's Magazine* might be dropped. Here the young New Englander may have met Edward Cave, who had commenced publication of that periodical a few months before.

In any event the *Gentleman's* for May, 1732, printed "The Last Will of Mr. Matthew A---y, late Bed-maker and Sweeper at Cambridge in New England." The *Gentleman's* imitator and rival, the *London Magazine,* also had access to the verses and printed them the same month. The New Haven sequel followed in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for June and in the *London Magazine* for August. At this

[14] *Ibid.*, I, 105*n.*

[15] *Ibid.*, I, 81.

[16] *Ibid.*, I, 79. The New England Coffee-house was located in "Sweeting's Alley, Threadneedle Street" some distance from the Temple. *Notes and Queries,* 12th Ser., IX (1921), 307.

[17] *Belcher Papers,* I, 128.

[18] Aytoun Ellis, *The Penny Universities* (London, 1956), p. 98.

point we find an editor tampering with the text for the first time. An interpolated stanza in the *London* version,

> A furrow'd brow,
> Where corn might grow,
> Such fertile soil is seen in't:
> A long hook nose,
> Tho' scorn'd by foes,
> For spectacles convenient.

scarcely raises the quality of the verse and does not seem to have survived its first printing until Sibley reprinted it in his 1854 edition.

Edward Ward, author of *The London Spy* (1698-1709), had composed a rhymed will shortly before his death in 1731, and the editor of the *London Magazine* reprinted it along with the first installment of *Father Abbey*. "A Taylor's Will, made in ---- Gaol," which appeared in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for October, 1732, is frankly imitative of Seccomb. A similar imitation, entitled "Ned Wealthy's Last Will and Testament," appeared in the *London Mazagine* for August, 1734.

According to Shipton, the poem was reprinted in the *European Magazine* for May, 1781. But the *European* did not commence publication until 1782, and I have been unable to find *Father Abbey's Will* in any of the early volumes of this periodical.

That one at least of the twenty-four or more broadside editions was printed in England is attested by the Loyalist Samuel Curwen of the class of 1735, who bought a copy (it bore the title *Old Timothy Jobson*) from a London street-vendor in 1782.[19] There are numerous minor variations in this version, which does not contain the New Haven sequel.

A four-line epitaph:

> Thus Father Abbey left his spouce
> As rich as church or College mouse
> Which is sufficient invitation
> To serve the College in his station

which usually appears at the end of the will was not in the original version and is presumably not by Seccomb.

The end of the eighteenth century saw what may be termed a re-

[19] MS note on Curwen's copy at the American Antiquarian Society.

vival of the poem's popularity. Perhaps this was due to the mock will written by William Biglow of the class of 1794. In later years Biglow was headmaster of the Boston Latin School until, says his biographer, "A propensity to convivial indulgences,—first acquired, no doubt, at College,—brought on infirm health, which compelled him to leave the school, and retire to his native village"[20] (where, I might add, despite infirmity he lived out the prescribed three-score years and ten). While an undergraduate he was noted for his wit and held the "Jack-knife," known as the "ugly" knife because it was bestowed each year on the ugliest member of the Senior class. When he passed the knife on to Charles Prentiss of 1795, he gave with it a burlesque will clearly inspired by *Father Abbey*, though greatly superior to the original in versification and humor.[21] Biglow was a regular contributor to the *Massachusetts Magazine* and doubtless communicated the prototype of his own poem to that periodical a few months after his graduation. "Gentlemen," the communication begins, "I do not remember to have seen Father Abbey's Will published in any late periodical work.—It was composed by Mr. Seccomb, formerly minister of Harvard, in this commonwealth, and who lately died, at an advanced period of life, in Nova-Scotia."[22] Seccomb had indeed lived on until 1792, never, says Mr. Shipton, having "lost the humor of the lad who wrote nonsense verse."[23]

Seccomb was not the only member of the class of 1728 to enjoy unusual longevity. Sixty-three years after the *Will* first appeared in the *Rehearsal* Thaddeus Mason was still alive to assure his grandson Thaddeus Mason Harris, editor of the *Massachusetts Magazine*, that his classmate and intimate friend John Seccomb was indeed the *real* author of the verses.[24]

Of the twenty-five old broadside editions of the poem which I have been able to locate not more than ten can have been printed earlier than 1790 and at least a dozen must have been done after 1800. Of the editions I have seen, what appears to be the earliest is printed

[20] Buckingham, *Specimens*, II, 277.

[21] B. H. Hall, *A Collection of College Words and Customs*, rev. edn. (Cambridge, 1856), pp. 477–480.

[22] *Mass. Mag.*, VI (1794), 696.

[23] Shipton, *Biographical Sketches . . . 1726–1730*, VIII, 489.

[24] *Mass. Mag.*, VII, 301–302.

on Genoese paper with a 1739 watermark, but the printing may have been done later. The earliest date which can be positively established for any broadside is the *Old Timothy Jobson* version bought by Samuel Curwen in London in 1782. It is possible, of course, that many earlier broadsides have disappeared entirely. The author of Mrs. Abdy's obituary, writing in 1762, refers to her late husband as "well known to the learned World by his Last Will and Testament,"[25] but there is some evidence that the poem enjoyed its greatest popularity around the turn of the century. Benjamin Russell printed two editions, one of which is dated 1797. Nathaniel Coverley printed one about 1800, and Leonard Deming produced at least four editions (one of which was to be had not only at "the Sign of the Barber's Pole" in Boston, but at Middlebury, Vermont) between 1828 and 1834. Thus some of these broadsides postdate Sibley's own undergraduate days, which ended in 1825. It is frequently impossible to date such broadsides with much accuracy. Types, ornaments, and cuts were used for many years, and were passed on from one printer to another. Ford in his *Massachusetts Broadsides*[26] furnishes an example of the unreliability of woodcut illustrations in dating such ephemeral printings. He gives 1772 as the approximate date of one of Benjamin Russell's broadside editions of *Father Abbey* because Russell used a woodcut picture of a dwarf which is found in Ames's *Astronomical Diary* for that year. Russell was eleven years old in 1772, and an almost identical edition, with the same woodcut, printed by him, is dated 1797. I venture to suggest, therefore, that the poem's greatest popularity may not have been achieved until sixty years after its first publication, at a time when it was already an antique.

The New Haven verses have been attributed to Colonel John Hubbard, New Haven physician. Nathaniel Paine made this attribution in 1897,[27] and it is repeated in a modern broadside edition of unknown origin in the collections of the American Antiquarian Society. However, I have found no contemporary suggestion that Seccomb was not

[25] *Boston Evening-Post,* Dec. 13, 1762. What may have been still another version of *Father Abbey* is hinted at in the advertisement following the obituary: "[*Father* Ab—y's *Will may be had of the Printers hereof.*]"

[26] *Broadsides, Ballads, &c. Printed in Massachusetts, 1639–1800,* ed. Worthington C. Ford, Mass. Hist. Soc., *Colls.,* LXXV (1922), 84.

[27] Nathaniel Paine, "Early American Broadsides, 1680–1800," Am. Antiq. Soc., *Procs.,* New Ser., XI (1896–97), 461.

the author; on the contrary, his contemporaries Mason and Belcher believed that he was.

The Harvard College Library has a broadside edition from which the New Haven verses and the usual epitaph are omitted. In their stead is a long "epitaph on M. Abdy" consisting of four twelve-line stanzas, aimed at impugning the sobriety of the deceased.

Critics have disagreed about the virtues of Seccomb's humor.[28] For my part, I incline to the view that Tyler's "untoward accident" in the form of a letter from a colonial governor to his son did indeed rescue a wretched exercise in bad taste from the oblivion it deserved.

FATHER ABBEY'S WILL: BROADSIDE AND OTHER PRINTINGS

In the listing that follows, I have attempted to list, locate, and describe the various printings of *Father Abbey's Will*, so far as they are known to me. The order of listing in the first section, on broadside printings, is at best only roughly chronological, for, as the text above indicates, only a very few of the broadsides can be definitely dated. I have given to the Massachusetts Historical Society photostats of the broadsides listed below; the Society already has in its collections originals of the other printings of the *Will*.

Location symbols are as follows:

AAS	American Antiquarian Society
B	John Hay Library, Brown University
BPL	Boston Public Library
GTG	George T. Goodspeed
HCL	Harvard College Library
HSP	Historical Society of Pennsylvania
JCB	John Carter Brown Library
MHS	Massachusetts Historical Society
WHS	Wellfleet Historical Society
Y	Yale University Library

[28] See Moses Coit Tyler, *A History of American Literature, 1607–1765*, 2 vols. (New York, 1878), II, 46–48; Trentwell M. White and Paul W. Lehmann, *Writers of Colonial New England* (Boston, 1929), p. 147; and Shipton, *Biographical Sketches . . . 1726–1730*, VIII, 483.

I. Broadside Printings

1. Father Ab--y's Will; | *To which is now added, A Letter of Courtship to his Vertuous and Amiable Widow.* | Cambridg, December [both in Gothic type], 1731. | Some Time since [&c.].
GTG, HCL (fragment)

With the New Haven poem and epitaph. Watermark "1739" above arrow-pierced heart, a device reproduced in W. A. Churchill, *Watermarks in Paper* (Amsterdam, 1935), No. 560, who says that it is Genoese. The orthography follows that of the *Rehearsal* version closely. There is one slight variation in the text: in the New Haven poem, VI, 5, reads, "I've *one Thing* more"; *Rehearsal* (see 26, below), "Nay I've too more." (*Gentleman's Magazine* [see 29, below], "two more.")

2. Father Ab--y's Will. | *To which is now addded* [*sic*], A Letter of Courtship to his Virtuous and Amiable Widow. | *Cambridge, December* 1731. | Some Time since [&c.]. AAS

With the New Haven poem and epitaph. Three columns, the stanzas numbered. Ford 610.

3. CAMBRIDGE, December 1731. | *Some Time since* [&c.].
HCL, JCB

With the New Haven verses and epitaph. Text in three columns. Ford 611.

4. [Cut.] | *Old* Timothy Jobson. | TO my dear Wife, my Joy and Life | [&c.]. [English, about 1780.] AAS

Father Abbey's Will, considerably altered. Without the New Haven verses or epitaph. An MS note on the AAS copy reads: "The following was wrote by [a] Mr. John Seccombe of Medford in the County of Middlesex Massachusetts Bay in New England on Father Abdy Bedmaker with his Wife and Sweeper of Massachusetts Colledge, commonly called New College in the Autumn of the year 1731 all of whom S. Curwen knew. Bot in a street in L[ond]on August 1 1782." Samuel Curwen of the Harvard class of 1735 died in 1802. Ford 618.

5. [Cut.] Father Abbey's | WILL. | Cambridge, Dec. 1731. | Some time since [&c.]. [About 1780.] HCL

Printed in two columns divided by an ornamental rule. With the New Haven verses and the first couplet of the epitaph. Ford 615.

6. FATHER ABBEY'S WILL. | CAMBRIDGE, December, 1730. | Some time since [&c.]. [About 1780.] HCL

With the epitaph but without the New Haven verses. Printed in four columns divided by ornamental rules.

7. [Row of type ornament.] | FATHER ABBEY'S WILL. | To which is now added, A Letter of Courtship to his virtuous and amiable Widow. | *Cambridge, December,* 1731. | Some time since [&c.]. | [Row of type ornament.] | Sold at the Printing-Office in Salem. [About 1780.] AAS

With the New Haven verses and epitaph. Ford 612.

8. [Cut at left.] Father Abbey's Will. | *To which is added, A* Letter *of* Courtship *to his virtuous & amiable Widow.* | CAMBRIDGE, *December,* 1731. Some Time since [&c.]. HCL, HSP

Reproduced in *American Broadside Verse,* ed. Ola E. Winslow (New Haven, 1930), p. 163. With the New Haven verses and epitaph. Printed in three columns. Ford 608.

9. [Cut at left as in 8 above.] Father Abbey's Will. | *To which is now added, A Letter of Courtship to his virtuous and amiable Widow.* | CAMBRIDGE *December,* 1731. | Some Time since [&c.]. BPL, HCL

Woodcut at upper left. At the bottom: "*Sold at the* Bible *and* Heart *in* Cornhill, BOSTON." With the New Haven verses and epitaph. Three columns in stanzas, unnumbered. Ford 609.

10. [Cut at left as in 8 and 9 above.] Father Abbey's Will. | *To which is now added, A Letter of Courtship to his virtuous and amiable Widow.* | CAMBRIDGE, *December,* 1731. | Some Time since [&c.]. WHS

At the bottom: "*Sold at the* Bible *and* Heart *in Cornhill,* Boston." With the New Haven verses and epitaph. Three columns in stanzas, unnumbered.

11. [Two cuts.] Father Abdy's | WILL | "Cambridge, December, 1730. | Some time since" [&c.]. HCL

Printed in two columns. The right-hand cut is the same as that in 5, above. Without the New Haven verses or the usual epitaph, but with a forty-four-line "Epitaph on M. Abdy" which I have not seen elsewhere. Ford 614.

12. [Two cuts.] *FATHER* ABBEY'S WILL: | *CAMBRIDGE, December,* 1730. | "Some time since" [&c.]. | *BOSTON:* PRINTED at RUS-|SELL'S OFFICE, near Liberty | Pole, 1797. Y

Text in two columns divided by rule of type ornaments. Without the New Haven verses but with the epitaph. Apart from the rule and the imprint date, practically identical with 13, below.

13. [Two cuts, as in 12 above.] *FATHER* ABBEY'S WILL. | *CAMBRIDGE, December,* 1730. | "Some time since" [&c.]. | *BOSTON:* PRINTED at RUS-|SELL'S OFFICE, near Liberty | Pole, [About 1797.] BPL, HCL, MHS

Text in two columns divided by a rule. Without the New Haven verses but with the epitaph. Ford 613.

14. [Ornamental rule.] | FATHER ABBEY'S WILL. | To which is now added, a letter of Courtship to his virtuous and amiable Widow | *Cambridge, December,* 1730. | Some time since [&c.]. HCL

With the New Haven poem and epitaph, in three columns. New Haven poem, VI, 5, "I've one thing more."

15. FATHER ABBEY'S WILL. | To which is added, a Letter of Courtship to his virtuous and amiable Widow. | *CAMBRIDGE,* December, 1731. | Some time since [&c.]. [About 1800.] GTG, HCL

The text is in three columns, divided by wavy rules. With the New Haven verses and epitaph.

16. [Ornamental rule with thistle device near center.] | FATHER ABBEY'S WILL. | *To which is added, a Letter of Courtship, to his virtuous and amiable widow.* | *CAMBRIDGE, December,* 1731. | Some time since [&c.]. | Printed and sold by NATHANIEL COVERLY, by the Gross or Single, corner of Theatre-Alley, Milk-street, Boston. GTG

The text is printed in three columns, separated by ornamental rules. With the New Haven verses and epitaph.

17. [Ornamental rule.] | FATHER ABBEY's WILL. | TO my

dear wife, [&c.]. | [Ornamental rule.] | Printed and sold at No. 5. Middle-street, Newburyport. B

In two columns, separated by an ornamental rule. Without the New Haven verses or epitaph.

18. [Two conventional woodcuts, with ornaments between.] | FATHER ABBEY'S WILL. | TO my dear wife, [&c.]. AAS, B

Fourteen stanzas in two columns, separated by a row of ornaments. Without the New Haven verses or epitaph. Ford 617.

19. FATHER ABBEY'S WILL. | *To which is added, a letter of Courtship, to his virtuous and amiable widow.* | CAMBRIDGE. December, 1731. | Some time since [&c.]. B

Text in three columns divided by rows of type ornaments.

20. FATHER ABBEY'S WILL, | To which is added, a letter of Courtship to his virtuous and amiable Wife. | *Some time since* [&c.]. | Sold Wholesale and Retail, by L. Deming, No. 1, South Side of Faneuil Hall, Boston. | Come farmer, come sailor, and all who delight in a joke;—Come, buy these cheap pleasures, they cost but a groat. [1829–1831.] AAS, MHS

The text is printed in three columns, with the imprint and rhymed advertisement, printed vertically, serving as rules. With the New Haven verses and epitaph.

21. Father Abbey's Will. | To which is adedd [sic], a letter of Courtship to his virtuous and amiable Wife. | *Some time since* [&c.]. | Sold Wholesale and Retail, by L. Deming corner of Merchant's Row & Market Square, Boston. | Come farmer, come sailor, and all who delight in a joke,—Come, buy these cheap pleasures, they cost but a groat.— [About 1832.] GTG, MHS

The text is printed in three columns, with the imprint and rhymed advertisement, printed vertically, serving as rules. With the New Haven verses and epitaph.

22. FATHER ABBEY'S WILL, | TO WHICH IS ADDED, A LETTER OF COURTSHIP TO HIS VIRTUOUS AND AMIABLE WIFE. | *Some time since* [&c.]. | Sold by L. DEMING, wholesale and retail, No. 62, Hanover Street, 2d door from Friend Street, Boston. | Just pub-

lished at DEMING's. The Chequer Player's Sure Guide; Life of Ambrose Gwinnett; Female Wanderer, &c. [About 1832.] GTG

At the head of the verses, a comic woodcut of a schoolmaster. Text in three columns, with imprint and advertisement, printed vertically between rules, serving as dividers. With the New Haven verses and epitaph.

23. FATHER ABBEY'S WILL, | TO WHICH IS ADDED, A LETTER OF COURTSHIP TO HIS VIRTUOUS AND AMIABLE WIFE. | *Some time since* [&c.]. | Sold wholesale and retail, by LEONARD DEMING, at the sign of the Barbers Pole, No. 61, Hanover Street, Boston, and at MIDDLEBURY, Vt. | Where may be found, the largest assortment of SONGS, that can be found in New England. PEDLERS will do well to examine them before purchasing elsewhere. [About 1832–1834.] B

At the head of the verses, a comic woodcut of a schoolmaster. Text in three columns, with imprint and advertisement, printed vertically between rules, serving as dividers. With the New Haven verses and epitaph.

24. [Elaborate type ornament emphasizing a burial urn and spreading over two columns.] | FATHER ABBEY'S WILL. | TO my dear wife [&c.]. GTG

Fourteen stanzas in two columns divided by a thin rule ("spinning" in VII, 6). Without the New Haven verses or epitaph.

25. FATHER | ABDY'S WILL.* | To which is added a *Letter of Courtship* to his amiable widow. | *Cambridge*, Dec. 1731. | SOME time since [&c.]. | [Following the New Haven verses:] * Written by Mr. John Seccombe, afterwards a settled minister at Harvard. | † Said to have been written by Col. John Hubbard of New Haven. [Modern.] AAS

With the New Haven verses and epitaph. Ford 616.

II. OTHER PRINTINGS

26. The Weekly Rehearsal, | Monday, January 3, 1732. | . . . . | *BOSTON*: Printed by *J. Draper*, for the Author . . . 1731. MHS

The Cambridge verses, without the epitaph, are printed on p. 2.

27. The Weekly Rehearsal, | Monday, February 7. 1732 | . . . . | *BOSTON*: Printed by *J. Draper*, for the Author . . . 1732. MHS

On p. 4: "*New Haven*, January 24. To the Author of the Rehearsal. *SIR*, OUR Sweeper having lately buryed his Spouse, and accidentally hearing the Death and Will of his deceas'd *Cambridge Brother*, has conceiv'd a violent Passion for the Relict. As Love softens the Mind, and disposes to Poetry, he has Eas'd himself in the following Strains, which he transmits to the charming Widow, as the first Essay of his Courtship." This is followed by the New Haven verses.

28. *The Gentleman's Magazine:* | Or, Monthly Intelligencer | Number XVII. for MAY, 1732. MHS

On p. 770: "The last WILL of Mr. Matthew A------y, late Bedmaker and Sweeper at Cambridge in New England."

29. the | London Magazine. | may, 1732. MHS

On p. 87: "The Last Will of Mr. *Matthew A----y* of *New-England*."

30. *The Gentleman's Magazine:* | Or, Monthly Intelligencer. | Number XVIII. for JUNE, 1732. MHS

On p. 821: "An Epistle from the Sweeper of the college of *Newhaven*, widower, to the Relict of his Brother *Sweeper* of *Cambridge* See p. 770."

31. the | London Magazine. | august, 1732. MHS

On p. 256: "*The Sweeper of* New-Haven *College in* New-England *lately becoming a Widower, conceived a violent Passion for the Relict of his deceased* Cambridge *Brother, (whose merry Will, see p.* 87.) *which he express'd in the following Strains.*"

32. the *MASSACHUSETTS MAGAZINE*: | or, MONTHLY MUSEUM | of *KNOWLEDGE and* rational *ENTERTAINMENT*. | No. XI.] for NOVEMBER, 1794. [Vol. VI. MHS

On p. 696: "*To the* Editors *of the* Massachusetts Magazine. gentlemen, *I do not remember to have seen Father Abbey's Will published in any late periodical work.—It was composd by Mr. Seccombe, formerly minister of Harvard, in this commonwealth, and who lately died, at an advanced period of life, in Nova-Scotia. I think it worth preserving in your magazine.*" The will is here printed with the epitaph and the New Haven verses.

33. FATHER ABBEY'S WILL; | TO WHICH IS ADDED | A LETTER OF COURTSHIP | TO HIS VIRTUOUS AND AMIABLE WIDOW. | [Rule.] | WITH HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES. | [Rule.] | PRIVATELY PRINTED. | [Rule.] | CAMBRIDGE. | 1854. MHS

Pp. [1]-14 + 1 blank leaf. Issued in plain brown wrappers. Edited by John Langdon Sibley. 50 copies printed. Reprinted from the *Cambridge Chronicle*, November 18, 1854.

James Burgh and American Revolutionary Theory

Oscar and Mary Handlin*

In 1790, Thomas Jefferson advised Thomas Mann Randolph on what a young man should read in preparation for a career in the law. The Secretary of State recommended Adam Smith, Montesquieu (with reservations), Locke's "little book on Government," the *Federalist*, and James Burgh's *Political Disquisitions*.[1] Jefferson was not alone in his respect for the last named work. John Adams acquired two "invaluable" copies when it appeared in 1774 and felt close enough to its author to write him about the course of affairs in Massachusetts, as if Burgh would understand and sympathize.[2] The *Political Disquisitions*, printed in England in 1774 and reprinted in Philadelphia in 1775, had a widespread influence upon the revolutionary generation —not only upon the leaders, but even more upon the common folk. Its phrases were familiar in the town meetings of western Massachusetts, for instance, for they seemed not only to make comprehensible and to justify the colonists' stand against England, but also to explain, so that any ordinary man could understand, the relation of the individual to government.[3]

If Burgh shone briefly and had an impact upon the revolutionary generation, he certainly failed to glow through the years in the galaxy of Adam Smith, Montesquieu, and Locke. In the nineteenth century his influence and even his memory faded; and it was not surprising that that should have happened. On rereading he proves to be an unsystematic thinker, able to quote readily from writers as diverse as Plato and Harrington; but he was by no means a Hume or Locke or

* This paper was read at the November, 1961, meeting.

[1] Thomas Jefferson, *Writings*, ed. A. A. Lipscomb and A. L. Bergh (Washington, 1903), VIII, 31.

[2] John Adams, *Diary and Autobiography*, ed. L. H. Butterfield et al., The Adams Papers (Cambridge, 1961), II, 182, 223; John Adams, *Works*, ed. C. F. Adams (Boston, 1850–56), IX, 351, 352.

[3] See, e.g., "Lenox Response" (1778), Massachusetts Archives (State House, Boston), CLVI, 378; J. E. A. Smith, *History of Pittsfield (Berkshire County,) Massachusetts from the Year 1734 to the Year 1800* (Boston, 1869), p. 336.

Montesquieu. Yet the question remains, what was the source of his appeal to the American revolutionary generation?

Conversant with the political ideas of his times, he used them to illustrate his dour view of the England he knew. His writings meandered over a wide range of contemporary problems. The decline of religious education, the debasement of manners, the need for improving rhetoric, the aggrandizement of the power of the Crown, corruption in voting, late marriages, insubordination of underlings—these were his subjects. The fact that he was sermonizing about the evils of his times explains why he was read so avidly by Americans. He had value to men who were interested in the failings of English society in the eighteenth century. Therein also lies his utility to the historian. Precisely because his comments were not embedded in a tight philosophical system and did not transcend the general assumptions of his times, they reflected sensitively important currents of contemporary opinion.

Burgh was a Scot, son of the minister of a parish in Perthshire, and a cousin of Dr. William Robertson, the historian. Born in 1714, Burgh attended the University of St. Andrews, where he hoped to prepare for the ministry in the Church of Scotland. Ill health interrupted his studies; he entered trade, where he lasted just long enough to lose a handsome fortune inherited from his eldest brother. At that point he decided to try his luck abroad, and moved to England. In London he corrected proof for a well-known printer, and supplemented his earnings by making indexes. After a year he became a teacher, serving in schools in Great Marlow and Enfield. None of these jobs was to his taste. "Being of a sociable disposition," he resented the confinement to the narrow round of boys' life.[4]

Burgh diverted himself in January, 1745/46, by writing *Britain's Remembrancer*, a tract on the Scottish rebellion. Exhilarated by the reception of this first effort, he composed *Thoughts on Education* a year later. By then he was a confirmed author; in the next fifteen years he turned out a succession of books: *Directions, Prudential and Moral* (1750), pirated and sold as *Youth's Friendly Monitor; An Hymn to the Creator of the World* (1750); *A Warning to Dram-Drinkers* (1751); *The Dignity of Human Nature* (1754); two pamphlets, *Political Specula-*

[4] *Biographia Britannica*, ed. Andrew Kippis, 2nd ed. (London, 1784), III, 15; John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1812), II, 264ff.

tions (1758), and *Rationale of Christianity* (1760); *The Art of Speaking* (1762); *Proposals . . . for an Association against the Iniquitous practices of Engrossers* (1764); *An Account of the . . . Cessares, A People of South America* (1764); *Crito, or Essays on Various Subjects* (1766, 1767), and *Political Disquisitions* (1774). In addition, from time to time, he wrote on current political subjects for newspapers such as *The General Evening Post* (signed "The Free Enquirer," in 1753 and 1754) and *The Gazetteer* (around 1770, signed "Colonist's Advocate" and "The Constitutionalist").[5]

Fame also permitted Burgh in 1747 to establish his own academy, first at Stoke Newington and then in adjacent Newington Green. He conducted this school until 1771, when he retired on account of ill health to a house at nearby Islington. As his own master, he could put into practice his theories of education. The immediate desideratum, to pull the country out of its morass, was the religious training of youth, not only for the present life, but for the hereafter. Boys were to learn grammar, orthography, pointing (punctuation), Latin, Greek, accounts, and astronomy, but above all, correct political principles. They were to be taught "the love of *liberty* and their *country*, and consequently the hatred of Popery, Tyranny, Persecution, Venality, and whatever else is against the interest of a free people." They would then understand "the proper medium betwixt an abject and slavish disposition in a people on the one side, and absolute licentiousness and a spirit of murmuring and complaining without reason against their governors, on the other." They would emerge with the conviction that "the true spirit of liberty is always corrected and restrained by a proper submission to government."[6]

[5] The following are the first editions of the works of James Burgh: *Britain's Remembrancer* (London, 1746); *Thoughts on Education* (London, 1747); *Directions Prudential, Moral, Religious and Scientific* (London, 1750; also pirated and sold as *Youth's Friendly Monitor*); *An Hymn to the Creator of the World* (London, 1750); *A Warning to Dram-Drinkers* (London, 1751); *The Dignity of Human Nature* (London, 1754); *The Art of Speaking* (London, 1761); *An Account of the first settlement, laws, form of government, and police, of the Cessares, a people of South America* (London, 1764); *Proposals . . . for an Association against the Iniquitous practices of Engrossers, Forestallers, Jobbers, &c., and for reducing the Price of Provisions, especially Butchers' Meat* (London, 1764); *Crito, or Essays on Various Subjects* (London, 1766, 1767); *Political Disquisitions* (London, 1774–75). In addition Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, II, 265, mentions two pamphlets of which no copies have been found: *Political Speculations* (1758) and *Rationale of Christianity* (1760). Verner W. Crane, *Benjamin Franklin's Letters to the Press* (Chapel Hill, [1950]), pp. 285ff., attributes the "Colonist's Advocate" series to Franklin.

[6] Burgh, *Thoughts on Education*, pp. 2, 7, 12.

At Newington, too, there were, at last, congenial people. In the eighteenth century this was a pleasant suburban village to which the young bloods of London had been accustomed to resort for cakes and ale on May Day. It held less than a thousand inhabitants and attracted retired statesmen and merchants who desired a rural retreat with easy access to London. Here one could readily go for an evening's diversion, and here one could recruit a wide company of friends.[7]

Newington Green had been noted for Dissent since the second half of the seventeenth century, when Charles Morton's Academy had begun to attract nonconformist parents and pupils to the area. Though no longer a "most rude wilderness" when Burgh moved there, Newington was still a charming rustic asylum from which one could view, but not be sullied by, the corruptions of London.[8]

Burgh did not start in Newington unconnected. His career in London and in the various academies in which he had taught had been smoothed by his own Dissent. A member of a minority group, he was able to move easily along a network of like-minded men that stretched from Scotland to London. Safely anchored by background, education, temperament, and habit within his nonconformist group, he judiciously selected his connections with the outside world, the approval of which, in turn, reinforced his sense of earnestness and righteousness.

Burgh's circle quickly widened. In 1751 he dedicated his *Warning to Dram-Drinkers* to Stephen Hales, Clerk of Closet to the Princess Dowager and chaplain to the Prince, and to Thomas Hayter, Bishop of Norwich and Preceptor of the young princes after the death of Frederick, Prince of Wales. That gave him entrée to the Princess Dowager's household, where he "met with a most gracious reception." The Princess Dowager herself "had much discourse" with him "on the subject of education and other topics," an event which Burgh must have ceaselessly related to his friends, for they remembered it well after his death. Burgh was so impressed by the Princess Dowager, "for whom he joins with all mankind in having the most profound regard and veneration," that he dedicated his *Dignity of Human Nature* to her. His intentions were simple—to urge the illustrious Princess to continue her "pious cares in forming" her "lovely offspring to virtue and

[7] Norman G. Brett-James, *Growth of Stuart London* (London, [1935]), p. 51.

[8] J. Lionel Tayler, *A Little Corner of London (Newington Green)* (London, 1925), pp. 15, 22ff.; Roland Thomas, *Richard Price* (London, 1924), pp. 30ff.; Walter Besant, *London in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1903), pp. 170ff.

to glory." Burgh hoped that his book would be helpful and referred coyly to his early success and to his repute among "persons in other parts of the world" who would not "fail to pay a peculiar regard to whatever comes from him."[9]

In Newington Burgh fell into and helped build up a "happy company." A weekly supping club met in turns at the houses of Dr. Richard Price, arrived as minister in 1758, Dr. Thomas Rogers, and Mr. Burgh. Joined by Mr. Thoresby, "the liberal and learned rector of Stoke Newington," this group formed a nucleus for a widening circle. Here Joseph Priestley was brought to meet Dr. Price. Here Benjamin Franklin came when he was in England. Teas, friendly visits, and dignified conversation enlivened an earnest, pleasant, genteel, and godly existence. Years later Samuel Rogers recollected how Dr. Price, who lived next door, would drop in in his dressing gown to spend the evening. "He would talk and read the Bible to us, till he sent us to bed in a frame of mind as heavenly as his own."[10]

As the Newington group spread its connections, it took to meeting weekly at the London Coffee-House, in Ludgate Hill. Here gathered a distinguished circle, heterogeneous in interest but drawn together by certain common assumptions and shared views and values which set them off from the scores of other clubs of London in this period. A selective element held together these clergymen, physicians, and other professionals. Others who drifted in but lacked those values quickly drifted out. Thus, Boswell, soon after the publication of his book on Corsica, regarded himself as a member, but his participation was short-lived, for he had other interests than the sober ones of the group.[11]

Their positions as outsiders in English society united those who continued to come. The growth of London had brought to the metropolis a variety of men of talent, Welshmen like Price, Scots like Burgh and Sir John Pringle, Yorkshiremen like Priestley and Andrew Kippis,

[9] *Biographia Britannica*, III, 15; Burgh, *Dignity of Human Nature*, pp. iii, iv, vi.

[10] P. W. Clayden, *Early Life of Samuel Rogers* (London, 1887), pp. 8, 11; R. Ellis, *Samuel Rogers and His Circle* [London, 1910], p. 8; Benjamin Franklin, *Writings*, ed. A. H. Smyth (New York, 1905–07), IV, 220; Thomas, *Richard Price*, pp. 38ff.; Carl C. Cone, *Torchbearer of Freedom, The Influence of Richard Price* (Lexington, Kentucky, 1952), pp. 53ff.; John Towill Rutt, *Life and Correspondence of Joseph Priestley* (London, 1831), I, 55, 60ff., 258, II, 109. See also J. H. Plumb, *England in the Eighteenth Century* (Harmondsworth, 1950), pp. 133ff.; Benjamin Franklin, *Papers*, ed. Leonard W. Labaree et al. (New Haven, 1961), IV, 404.

[11] Frank Brady and F. A. Pottle, *Boswell in Search of a Wife* (New Haven, 1956), pp. 161, 167, 300.

Quakers like Peter Collinson and John Fothergill, and provincials like Franklin. These men regarded the turmoil of life in the great city with mingled awe and distrust. In addition, some of them were teachers and almost all of them were Dissenters; and their alienation from the established church led them to regard the society in which they lived with a critical eye. Their faith was science, education, and the application of the principles of correct reason to the problems of the day. Earnestly dedicated to doing right, they believed in the power of moderate common sense and knowledge to improve the lot of their fellow men.

And what a world they found about them in Georgian England and particularly London! Across the Thames and to the westward, the men of new wealth were building homes of unprecedented lavishness. There were clubs of quite another sort. Grocers made rich by speculation, nabobs come back from the colonies, gentry bored with life in their estates flocked to the capital and threw themselves into an unabashed quest for wealth and pleasure. Debauchery spread through the habits of new and old families: to gamble, to drink oneself into a stupor, to dally promiscuously with mistresses and lovers were the accepted conventions of a society in which no one knew his place or station and in which obligations had no binding quality.

The corruption of morals extended also into politics. Ministers of state and members of Parliament shared the vices of those they represented. Government became an enormous speculative enterprise in which rival cliques and factions struggled for their own advantage. To the sober men of Newington, physically close to the sink of iniquity yet spiritually remote from it, the first requisite of any change for the better was a thorough moral regeneration of the whole country.[12]

The call for that rebirth rang through everything that Burgh wrote. His first work, *Britain's Remembrancer,* published toward the end of the rebellion in Scotland, had warned that God distressed nations "for no other end than the punishment of guilt, and the moral improvement of mankind." Britain could disregard the handwriting on the wall only at the peril of utter ruin. In one season it had faced a dearth of corn and a Popish pretender. It had this time escaped but could not

[12] M. Dorothy George, *London Life in the XVIIIth Century* (London, 1925), pp. 27ff.; Besant, *London in the Eighteenth Century,* pp. 14, 308ff., 345ff., 360ff., 399ff., 455ff.; Jay B. Botsford, *English Society in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1924), 86ff., 128ff., 162ff., 243ff.

always expect mercy. It was time to mend its ways. Vice had infected not only the rich, but the entire nation, which was heading toward the fate of other empires debilitated by luxury.

"*French* fopperies" and ostentation, lassitude and irreligion, and theaters distracted the people. No one did an honest day's work, and bankruptcies increased because young traders were more interested in living well than in paying their debts. But then the prevalent irreligion made perjury a small matter. Oaths were readily disregarded and bribery was common. "Unhappy divisions" were the result. The rich got into financial difficulties; the inferior ranks, finding their affairs in disorder, became "dupes to the heads of factions" and joined "in the clamour against their governors." "Thus they that are least qualified for finding fault, are, generally speaking, loudest in their complaints."

The clergy must lead the way to reform. The magistrates, in town or country, must enforce the laws guarding morals. The wealthy traders must set an example of industry, sobriety, and economy. Above all, education must form the minds of the young and imbue them with religion. Only then could England be saved. These mild injunctions were "so much read and applauded by persons of a religious temper, that the book went through five editions in little more than two years."[13]

Dismayed by "this thoughtless and voluptuous age," Burgh continued to write in the same moralistic vein. In 1754 his *Dignity of Human Nature* again recorded his forebodings and his suggestions for improvement. He despaired of the future "while a continual sound of idle and expensive amusements fill up the bulk of our time." The true dignity of human nature, he explained, encompassed the attributes of prudence, knowledge, virtue, and revealed religion. For the young setting out in life, prudence or a turn of mind which induced a person to look forward and enable him "to judge rightly of his behaviour" was "indispensably necessary." Too many, alas, were improvident. They spent before they knew what they could earn or how many children they would have to support. Speaking out of turn, venting singular opinions, satire, boasting, lying, were all imprudent. Prudence involved circumspect behavior; there was no "more promising sign in a

[13] *Biographia Britannica*, III, 14; Burgh, *Britain's Remembrancer*, reprinted in *A Monitory Address to Great Britain* (Edinburgh, 1792), pp. 260ff., 272ff., 278ff. References are to this edition throughout.

young person, than a readiness to hear the advice of those whose age and experience" qualified them for mature judgments.

Method and regularity in business were essential. "Indefatigable diligence, joined with frugality," permitted people of "the lowest and most laborious stations in life" so to raise themselves as to relieve themselves from labor and anxiety in old age. A few shillings saved each day mounted up in a year; in thirty years they formed an enormous total, particularly if put into "an advantageous trade." One should neither borrow nor lend incautiously nor deal more than was necessary with strangers. It was more important to be frugal of time than of money, lest opportunities be lost. "Those pleasures of life, which cost the most," were the least satisfactory; balls, plays, masquerades, gilt coaches, and powdered footmen could not compete with the "endearments of a faithful wife and innocent children" or "the study of virtue and religion . . . ever new and ever delightful." "Employing . . . working people in improving barren grounds, . . . raising buildings for a continual increase of tenants upon a thriving estate, . . . the encouragement of manufactures, and providing for the poor; these are the arts that will gain a country-gentleman more popularity, than keeping open house the whole year round."

This was not to imply that a businessman should deny himself "the moderate use of such innocent amusements, as his fortune or leisure will allow"—for instance, "reading, viz. history, lives, geography, and natural philosophy; with a very little choice poetry; the conversation of a few agreeable friends; and drawing, where there is a genius for it. To these may be added, riding on horseback once or twice in a week, where it can be done conveniently." Music, on the other hand, "is never safely indulged." Desire for excelling in it "generally draws people into an expense of time and money, above what the accomplishment, carried to the greatest lengths, is worth."[14]

It was therefore best to marry young, as soon as it was possible to support a family. In London and other cities marriage was regarded "as the end of all the happiness of life" and was therefore unseasonably postponed, so that the country was enfeebled by a declining population. When entered into with prudence, marriage was the beginning of true pleasure. It was well to seek not a woman with "the most exquisite beauty, the most sprightly wit, or the largest fortune" but

[14] Burgh, *Dignity of Human Nature,* pp. iv, vff., 2, 3ff., 30, 32–39.

rather one with "common sense" and "good nature." Then the family would be able to sustain its responsibility for raising children to love school, work, and frugality, that is, to form "a rational creature."[15]

Burgh's basic concern was thus with moral issues. But his environment and the temper of the times pushed him into political speculation. Some of the problems he discussed had implications for government, and the give-and-take of conversation at the club and of his correspondence with friends compelled him to deal with the role of the state in human affairs. His theories of politics emerged not from a systematic analysis but from ad hoc discussions of specific evils. Nevertheless certain general assumptions can be discerned in his utopian tract and in his political writings.

Selfishness produces licentiousness in society and venality and corruption in government. Extravagance impoverishes the wealthy and disorganizes the poor, so all seek only their own ends, heedless of the effects upon the social order. Agitators appear, concealing their true intentions beneath lofty slogans; for generally "a patriot is only a Courtier out of place, and a Courtier a Patriot in place." People became so contentious that even "the lowest of the mob . . . takes the liberty, over his cups, to rail at the legislators of his country."[16] Thus appear the unhappy divisions which are a curse upon England, for they destroy the whole fabric of society. The world cannot carry on "if children, apprentices, servants . . . were to spend time in disputing the commands of their superiors."[17]

Such license destroys liberty, for "liberty does not exclude restraint; it only excludes unreasonable restraint." Reason must prevail over licentiousness, the "doing whatever the will, appetites and passions suggest." Since "true liberty desires only the freedom of doing what is agreeable to the dictates of reason and the rules of religion," men motivated by true love of country neither submit slavishly to their governors nor complain without reason against them. "The design of all government" must allow "the governed the liberty of doing what, consistently with the *general* good, they may desire to do, and which only forbids their doing the contrary." Only thus can society be sure

[15] Burgh, *Dignity of Human Nature*, pp. 50–61.

[16] Burgh, *Britain's Remembrancer*, pp. 278; Burgh, *Dignity of Human Nature*, p. 273.

[17] Burgh, *Thoughts on Education*, p. 12; Burgh, *Dignity of Human Nature*, pp. 31, 274.

of that order which is an absolute necessity for the highest development of human dignity.[18]

The law determines "precisely how far *personal* liberty is compatible with the *general* good"; and since the object of government is the "securing the happiness of the whole," it follows that "the *consent* of the whole *people*, as far as it can be obtained, is indispensably *necessary* to every law, by which the whole *people* are to be bound." Subjects in a "free country" have the same rights as stockholders in a company.[19]

In an ideal state, the whole populace would be presented a form of government, would make alterations, and by their approval would express "their submission" and become "entitled to all the privileges of citizenship," eligible to vote and to hold office. Sober, industrious, and peaceable newcomers were to be "permitted to subscribe the laws of the land" and thereby become citizens. Papists were necessarily excluded from citizenship, since their religion "sanctifies all manner of oppression and cruelty to protestants, and therefore must naturally prove destructive to every protestant state." Toleration was enough for them.

Well guided in their power to vote, the citizens would set up a government with a hereditary executive of limited powers and a senate elected for life, all subject to recall. Inspectors, also chosen by the people, would inquire into manners and conduct to preserve the virtue of the nation. This mixed form would "preserve a due balance, and keep a happy medium between the tyranny of arbitrary monarchy, the factions of aristocracy, and the anarchy, licentiousness, and wild tumults of a democracy."[20]

There is no "perfect commonwealth," however. Only rarely have people formed "a constitution from the foundation"; and even the wisest governments have suffered from selfish or wicked pressures. Political establishments are therefore usually based upon chance vestiges of older systems woven into the new ones, vestiges which obscure "the spirit of the constitution." To assert, as Hume did, that whatever "is publicly allowed at any particular period, may be said to be constitutional at that period" is to beg the question. If the machinery of government operates so that the people have no share in

[18] Burgh, *Thoughts on Education*, p. 12; Burgh, *Cessares*, p. 26*n*.; Burgh, *Political Disquisitions*, I, 2ff.

[19] Burgh, *Political Disquisitions*, I, 2ff.; Burgh, *Crito*, I, 2.

[20] Burgh, *Cessares*, pp. 16, 26, 27, 40, 48-53.

power, they become "mere beasts of burden, instead of what they are, viz. the original of power, the object of government, and last resource."[21]

Yet, though power derives from the people, few "have originally so principled their constitution, that they themselves can without violence to it, lay hold of its power, wield it as they please, and turn it, when necessary, against those to whom it was entrusted, and who have exerted it to the prejudice of its original proprietors." In England Parliament "is constitutionally the last resort," and there is no provision for regular appeal to the people who may be compelled "to take into their own hands the dangerous work of vindicating their liberties by force."[22]

To avoid a course that can only lead to anarchy and tyranny, the government must speak for the people. The constitution provides for "government by kings, lords, and commons." But actually, power is "vested in a *small* number of individuals" who link the legislative to the executive power. The Court influences elections and through its ministers, placemen, and pensioners prevents the Commons from representing the people. The Lords extend their power beyond their own house. "Can the house of commons," then, "be called even the shadow of a representation of the property of the people?" Only restoration of the House of Commons as a check on regal and ministerial tyranny would preserve the constitution and enable the governed to express their consent. That would require revision of representation in Parliament, curtailment of the length of sessions, and elimination of corruption.[23]

Everybody should be represented, for everybody has "unalienable property . . . a personal liberty, a character, a right to his earnings, a right to a religious profession and worship according to his conscience." Even the dependents on charity have wives and children "in whom they have a right." Although it is not feasible that the poor should vote, many others remain unrepresented. Only "a few beggarly boroughs" elect Parliament, rendering it a "juntocracy . . . or government by a minister and his crew," with the Court directing "the beggars whom to choose." Great parts of Middlesex, Kent, and Surrey,

[21] Burgh, *Cessares*, p. 50; Burgh, *Political Disquisitions*, I, v, 22, 23, 72.

[22] Burgh, *Political Disquisitions*, I, 4, 6ff.

[23] Burgh, *Political Disquisitions*, I, 24, 50, 386ff., 406, III, 272, 310.

and the inhabitants of Bristol, Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, and Ely have either inadequate representation or none at all; and "the overbalance of the power in the hands of the landed men" works to the disadvantage of the manufacturing and mercantile interest.[24]

An adequate plan would accord "property . . . in all states . . . proportional weight and consequence" by giving each county that percentage of the 513 members proportionate to its "contribution to the public expence." Within the county, "men of large property" would "have more votes, than those, who have less to secure." Annual elections and the exclusion by rotation of placemen and pensioners would further make the Commons representative.[25]

Unless such reforms are effected, the people will take power in their own hands; they will prefer the temporary evils of "dethroning a King, oversetting a government, or even massacring a court" to tyranny, "a permanent evil, distressing and debasing the human species from generation to generation, and deluging the world in a never ebbing sea of blood." "And if, headed by a spirit of an unusual boldness, they do rise like a whirlwind, and sweep away the combination against their liberties," they may give rise to new tyrants who "rivet on the unhappy people the very fetters they had just before knocked off."[26]

This eventuality is, however, undesirable and at almost every cost to be avoided. To treat Burgh's intentions as revolutionary is to misread the context in which they developed. His writings aimed to strengthen rather than to overturn the existing order; and so they were interpreted by his English contemporaries who hoped that a reading of the *Political Disquisitions* would persuade the "men at the helm" to "remove those public evils" which the book exposed.[27]

"All sound patriots will avoid rousing the people, if redress can be any other way obtained." Therefore Burgh does not propose recourse to force, but hopes "to apply the power of the people, guided, limited,

[24] Burgh, *Political Disquisitions*, I, 27, 36ff., 49ff., 53; "Constitutionalist," *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser* (London), Feb. 28, 1770.

[25] Burgh, *Political Disquisitions*, I, 39, 49, 127.

[26] Burgh, *Political Disquisitions*, III, 311, 312.

[27] *Monthly Review* (London), L (1774), 109ff., LI (1774), 344ff., LIII (1775), 109ff., 115; John Nichols, *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1831), VI, 61. See also Herbert Butterfield, *George III, Lord North and the People 1779–1780* (London, 1949), pp. 259–266; Eugene C. Black, "The Association," (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1958), p. xvi.

and directed by men of property, who are interested in the security of their country . . . to prevent the application of the same power unrestrained, unlimited, and directed by mere caprice, or the spirit of party." The government might then "grant, voluntarily, and with a good grace, that redress, to which the people have an undoubted right, and which they see the people resolute to have."

To this end a "grand national association for obtaining an independent parliament" is urgently needed. More detailed plans might deter some from joining. Therefore, it is best "to leave to the wisdom of succeeding times to determine the particular steps to be taken." Meanwhile may the King of Kings "open the eyes of this unthinking people," to "send forth a spirit of wisdom, and of union, of submission to wise and just government, and of courage to resist oppression and tyranny," for "Thou art thyself the glorious patron of liberty. Thy intention was, that man should be free."[28]

Any ordering of Burgh's political ideas reveals that the perspective was entirely negative. When he reached for positive images he could only fasten on the reverse of what he saw about him; and such ideals he affixed to places remote in either time or space. There are therefore frequent though vague appeals to an earlier England, where order still rested on the "sober and regular manners of our fathers."[29]

Hence the special place of the colonies in the strategy of Burgh's argument. The colonists were mostly farmers, "wholly dependent on the produce of their lands, contented, and consequently happy" until taxes were imposed because of the "*voraciousness* of the *court-tools*." Against great odds, the Americans prospered. Their natural increase was due to the "sobriety, and temperate way of living, practised by the Dissenters retired to" the New World. The well-being of New England, Carolina, and Pennsylvania rested on "the education of their planters." Strict laws in New England disciplined the society; there "adultery, blasphemy, striking or cursing a parent, and perjury in matters of life and death" were capital offenses. In New England, too, "great care is taken . . . of the morals of the Indians . . . particularly to prevent drunkenness." What a contrast to Britain, where "the government gains by the drunkenness of the people." In the colonies

[28] Burgh, *Political Disquisitions*, III, 426, 428, 455, 457ff.

[29] Burgh, *Britain's Remembrancer*, p. 273; Burgh, *Crito*, II, 71.

Englishmen live in the freedom that is the result of avoiding the vice and corruption of the Old World; the noble simplicity of their manners and their rusticity is an effective contrast to the degradation of the Court and of London society. There the people "keep up the right of instructing their members," while in England the institution has so decayed that the members of Parliament hold themselves unaccountable.[30]

The evils of English government become most apparent in relation to the colonies. The grievances of the Americans are evidence of the selfishness of courtiers, of the shortsightedness of placemen, and of the deficiencies of an unrepresentative Parliament. This outpost of liberty is resisting the corruption of British ministers who "have opened a wound perhaps never more to be healed—all to get a few more *places* for their wretched dependents." Increased taxes only increased the opportunity to embezzle. "The iron rod of oppression" cannot but break "the free spirit of the colonists."[31]

The flattering image of themselves that Burgh held up to the American colonists no doubt helped make his books popular. The provincials were pleased to learn that their society was better, purer, nobler than that of the mother country. His strictures upon the immorality of ministers and Parliament added to the conviction of Americans in the righteousness of their own cause and made it easier for them to condemn the villainy of their rulers. As the conflict passed the point of possible reconciliation, the Americans were quick to circulate Burgh's latest views. The *Political Disquisitions* was immediately reprinted in Philadelphia. A list of "encouragers" revealed that the work was well launched and its contents known in advance. At the head of the roster of sponsors was "His Excellency, George Washington, Esq.; Generalissimo of all the Forces in America, and a Member of the Honorable, the American Continental Congress." Samuel Chase of Maryland, John Dickinson, Silas Deane, Christopher Gadsden, John Hancock, Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Mifflin, George Ross, Roger Sherman, John Sullivan, Charles Thomson, and James Wilson were among the other subscribers. John Adams set himself "to make the Disquisitions more known and attended to in several parts

[30] Burgh, *Political Disquisitions*, I, 184, 204ff., II, 274, 311ff., III, 30, 31, 219.
[31] *Ibid.*, II, 274ff., 276.

of America" and wrote that they were "held in as high estimation by all" his friends as by himself.[32]

Approval in America increased the sensitivity of Burgh and his group to colonial opinion. Visitors like Franklin and Josiah Quincy served as media of communication, and a steady stream of pamphlets and tracts flowed eastward across the Atlantic. Mutual esteem gave both parties to the exchange a feeling of strength and pushed them toward an ever more radical view of existing authority.[33]

Finally, the Americans found it helpful, in these years of intense political debate, to draw upon the armory of intellectual weapons Burgh put at their disposal. His books were immense grab bags, liberally loaded with quotations. Here appeared the honest whig views of the authors of *Cato's Letters,* the classic theories of Locke, Harrington, and Sydney, and the authority of Blackstone and Bolingbroke, as well as the ancient wisdom of Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero. Many colonists who never got to read the authors in the original were able to quote them with assurance by dipping into Burgh.

They could do so because there was a significant congruence between Burgh's ideas on government and those which the colonists had developed out of other sources in other ways. The formulation at which the Scotsman arrived out of his criticism of English society bore striking resemblances to that which Americans reached by positive generalizations about the institutions which had in actuality evolved about them. The key concepts were similar in their theoretical expression; they were profoundly different in the practical meaning attached to them. Both the similarities and differences are important.

Thus Burgh, and indeed all the successors of Locke, spoke of the consent of the governed in terms analogous to those the revolutionary theorists used. But the context was by no means the same. The concept, for Burgh, was a means of exemplifying the failings of parliamentary representation. To explain the corruption of Parliament, he had to account for the defects in the selection of its members. The existing scheme of representation was inadequate because it failed to elicit the consent of the population; and its failure to do so was the basis on which his more general criticism of Parliament rested.

[32] *Ibid.* (Philadelphia, 1775 edn.), III, 3rd to 6th preliminary leaves; Adams, *Works,* IX, 351; Zoltán Haraszti, *John Adams and the Prophets of Progress* (Cambridge, 1952), p. 302.

[33] Burgh, *Political Disquisitions,* II, vii; Franklin, *Writings,* VI, 429ff., VIII, 8ff., 154, 451, 457; J. P. Agnew, *Richard Price and the American Revolution* (Urbana, 1949), pp. 2, 3.

The consent of the governed thus became for Burgh the broad foundation of social order; it comprehended proper representation in the institutions of government but also obedience to rulers, the respectful relationship of inferiors to superiors, and the acceptance of discipline. He could conceive of consent in an ideal form, as when the citizens of his Utopia organized their state, or in a practical form, as in the projected national association to secure the reform of Parliament. But in either case, it was a criterion against which to measure the disorderly behavior of Parliament. Burgh could also envision a popular uprising when the continued disregard of the need for consent demonstrated the lack of social order: Jamaica, Corsica, and possibly the American colonies were instances. But he did not find such an outcome conceivable in England.

All this was grist for the argumentative mills of the colonists as they debated the propriety of taxation without representation. An attack by an Englishman on an unrepresentative Parliament which lacked consent certainly supported their own position. But in addition the concept of consent was appropriate to their own position in a way that Burgh could not imagine. The emergence of government from an act of popular consent was for him a utopian abstraction; in the colonies it was living reality. The national association was a visionary program for the future; in America the practice of association was a day-to-day actuality. What was described as an ideal on one side of the ocean existed in fact on the other.

Furthermore the revolutionaries wrenched the concept of consent out of the orderly context in which Burgh located it. For him the corollary of consent had been obedience to established authority. But the Americans who defined the English laws moved toward another conclusion. The errors and injustices of Parliament proved the fallibility of all governments and the necessity of popular vigilance in defense of liberty. Consent thus became a continuous process by which the people passed upon the validity of the acts of their rulers. Grievances were by no means to be submitted to but resisted by precisely such uprisings as Burgh dreaded in England.

Years later John Adams understood and feared the implications of his countrymen's idea of consent. He complained in 1789 that Mr. Burgh's *Political Disquisitions,* along with *Common Sense,* propagated among the people "a too ardent and inconsiderate pursuit of erroneous

opinions of government." He had by then forgotten that the views to which he objected emanated not from Burgh but from what Americans made of him.[34]

There was a similar divergence in the concept of the constitution. In his ordinary use of the word, Burgh trapped himself in a circular argument. The term constitution usually meant for him the orderly machinery of government as it existed. But he also wished to show that Parliament's actions were bad and therefore against the constitution or the spirit or intent of the constitution. Yet Parliament was the ultimate resort in determining what was constitutional, and reform could come only from it. The people could do no more than urge it to adhere to the true spirit of the constitution. Hence the association could only urge that King, Commons, and Lords each take its rightful place in the order of government.

Burgh also conceived of a constitution in another, more abstract, sense. In a new society, such as that of his utopia, the people could start afresh and frame a constitution of government. But that sense was by no means applicable to a settled society, where such efforts could only lead to violence, anarchy, and tyranny.

The revolutionaries readily accepted Burgh's criticism of parliamentary action as unconstitutional. But they did not apply the term constitution to the existing order of government, which was corrupt and venal and a device for filling the pockets of a few favorites at the expense of the rest of the population. To them the term meant something altogether new. They conceived of themselves in the position of the people of Cessares, starting afresh. The constitution was the written charter or agreement from which the government drew authority. The correction of abuses or deficiencies called not for gradual amendment from within the existing system but rather for frequent new beginnings.[35]

Finally, there was a significant difference in the treatment of liberty. Burgh's specific discussion of rights and privileges hinged on criticisms of existing defects in government. Thus the consideration of the inequity of parliamentary representation led into a definition of privilege as an unwarranted or dangerous pre-eminence, distinguished

[34] Adams, *Works*, IX, 558ff. We have discussed, in general, the American conception of consent in our *Dimensions of Liberty* (Cambridge, 1961), pp. 225ff.

[35] Handlin, *Dimensions of Liberty*, pp. 254ff.

from a right. A discussion of prosecutions for libel led to an exposition of the liberty of speech and writing.

But Burgh also used liberty in a more general sense. "Since we are all brethren," his utopians explained, "and God has given to all men a natural right to liberty, we allow of no slavery among us; unless a person forfeits his freedom by his crimes." True liberty in this sense was equated with virtue and with the capacity for doing what was good and reasonable. Hence it followed that in his own day liberty seemed "indeed to be bidding mankind farewell." Redemption could come, but only through education and the reform of manners, which would restore virtue.[36]

The appeals for the restoration of liberty were therefore always rhetorical, never related to the specific abuses of particular rights or particular liberties, which could only be acquiesced in until Parliament was persuaded of their unreasonableness. Thus in the abstract Burgh accorded even the dependent poor the right to vote. But in practice he could envision no orderly pattern of suffrage but one related to the amount of property.

The colonists never distinguished as Burgh did between abstract liberty and concrete liberties. Liberty was a general state, equated with a natural inalienable right of man from which all specific rights derived or to which all were linked. They therefore set Burgh's attack on specific abuses in a totally different context shaped by their own experience.[37]

Burgh's function was to formulate a few political propositions basically critical of the institutions under which he lived. In doing so he drew upon ideas widely current in his own times and particularly concentrated in the circle in which he moved. He thus acted as a conveyor between the speculative minds with which he had contact and the wide body of his readers.

These ideas had an impact in the colonies. The Americans were delighted with his comments favorable to them and hostile to their enemies. They gobbled up his aphorisms, rhetoric, and occasional invective. It was titillating to find an Englishman referring to monarchs as worms. Such slurs undoubtedly emboldened John Adams in his

[36] Burgh, *Cessares*, p. 83; Burgh, *Political Disquisitions*, III, 415.
[37] Handlin, *Dimensions of Liberty*, pp. 58ff.

references to the royal ministers as "sharpers, gamblers, and horse-jockies."[38]

In addition, these writings communicated certain general ideas about the nature of government. But the ideas did not survive the transmission intact. In the crossing they were adapted to the context in which they were to be embedded. Such changes were often of the utmost importance and yet were effected subtly and without notice. The concept of monarchy was a dramatic example. Burgh, like other eighteenth-century writers, could conceive of a utopian polity without a king. But no more than any other European writer of his time could he imagine that the actual government of his own country could function in an orderly manner without the Crown.

The colonists were sensitive to no such discriminations between the ideal and the actual; royalty had no place in their own society. And whatever the abstract theories to which they adhered, Americans never seriously contemplated the possibility of anointing a king in the New World. It was the same with such concepts as consent, constitution, and liberty. Even when the same words were used, and the same formal principles adhered to, a novel situation transformed their meaning.

These distinctions have a general relevance to the diffusion of ideas from one society to another. They also have a more specific application to the role of ideas in the revolutionary period. Regarded in the abstract, theories of the nature of the state are almost independent of time and place. But abstractions have rarely goaded men into action; in the application to concrete situations, ideas acquire a specificity that gives them historical significance.

It is altogether possible to link Burgh, as Caroline Robbins has, with a general line of speculation derived from the Commonwealth period. Indeed it is possible to draw the line much farther back to Cicero. But the meaning of the Scottish schoolmaster's ideas can only be grasped in the light of his moral revulsion from the conditions of eighteenth-century London.[39]

So too, it is possible to link the revolutionary currents of thought

[38] Adams, *Works*, IX, 351.

[39] Caroline Robbins, *The Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman* (Cambridge, 1959), pp. 363ff.; George H. Sabine and Stanley B. Smith, *Marcus Tullius Cicero on the Commonwealth* (Columbus, Ohio, 1929), pp. 39ff., 51ff.

in the colonies with general lines of eighteenth-century political theory, as Americans themselves frequently did. The Revolutionary colonists certainly had intimate links not only with the English group of which Burgh was a part but also with like-minded Hollanders and Frenchmen. With reason Jefferson once explained that the Declaration of Independence had not aimed "to find out new principles" or "to say things which had never been said before; but to place before mankind the common sense of the subject" which had already been expressed "in conversation, in letters, printed essays, or in the elementary books of public right, as Aristotle, Cicero, Locke, Sidney, etc."[40] But it is misleading to interpret that to mean, as Carl Becker and Robert Palmer have, that the Declaration merely set forth ideas generally held in the western world of the eighteenth century.[41] Jefferson's explanation proceeded to refer to the Declaration as "an expression of the American mind."[42] It was not only related to broad principles that could be traced as far back as Aristotle; it was also distinctive of its own time and place.

James Burgh is significant as an aid in making out those elements of distinctiveness. Precisely because he was not a great theorist, he reflected the attitudes of a particular time and place. By virtue of his situation, he was as close to American thought as any European of his time; and the differences between his ideas and those of the colonists who read him illuminates an important facet of the development of "the American mind."

[40] Thomas Jefferson, *Writings*, ed. P. L. Ford (New York, 1892–99), X, 343. See also [André] Morellet, *Memoires inédits de l'Abbé Morellet*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1882), pp. 307ff.; Richard Price, *Nadere Aanmerkingen over den Aart end de Waarde der burgerlyke Vryheid*, transl. Johan Derk van der Capellan (Leyden, 1777), pp. 2, 30ff., 43; Baron van der Capellan to Richard Price, Massachusetts Historical Society, *Proceedings*, 2nd Ser., XVII (1903), 313ff.; Abraham J. van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenboek der Nederlanden* (Haarlem, 1852–78), III, 148ff.

[41] Jefferson, *Writings*, ed. Ford, X, 343; R. R. Palmer, *The Age of the Democratic Revolution* (Princeton, 1959), pp. 213, 214; Carl L. Becker, *The Declaration of Independence* (New York, 1940), pp. 24–25; Benjamin F. Wright, *American Interpretations of Natural Law* (Cambridge, 1931), pp. 98, 99.

[42] Jefferson, *Writings*, ed. Ford, X, 343.

The Peace Convention of February, 1861

Samuel Eliot Morison*

Now that we are in the midst of Civil War celebrations, it may be profitable to direct our attention from the fighting which seems chiefly to interest the public, and take a new look at a sincere last-minute effort to prevent the war. The best known of these efforts are the Crittenden Compromise propositions, which Senator John J. Crittenden of Kentucky worked on from December, 1860, to February, 1861. These, and their fate in Congress, have been described at great length by James Ford Rhodes, J. G. Randall, Allan Nevins, and other historians. But a second, and in my opinion more important, effort to prevent the Civil War was the Peace Convention of delegates from twenty-one states which met at Washington during February, 1861.[1]

This convention was summoned by invitation of the General Assembly of Virginia on January 19, 1861. The Crittenden Compromise proposals were encountering heavy weather in Congress, and it was hoped that a convention of the states could give these, or similar measures, authoritative support. Congress was unable to give compromise measures its undivided attention, and a convention could. And state governors, judges, and businessmen could be chosen to a convention and give it a broader base in the country.

In the Virginia resolution calling the Peace Convention, the Assembly declares its "deliberate opinion" to be "that unless the unhappy

* This paper was read at the May, 1961, meeting. Subsequent to its preparation, two other studies on the same subject were published: Robert G. Gunderson, *Old Gentlemen's Convention: The Washington Peace Conference of 1861* (Madison, 1961) and Jesse L. Keene, *The Peace Convention of 1861*, Confederate Centennial Studies, No. 18 (Tuscaloosa, 1961).

[1] The stenographic notes of the Convention were printed by its secretary, Lucius E. Chittenden of Vermont, as *A Report of the Debates and Proceedings in the Secret Sessions of the Conference Convention, for Proposing Amendments to the Constitution of the United States* (New York, 1864). Chittenden also writes of the Convention in his *Recollections of President Lincoln* (New York, 1904 edn.) and Governor Boutwell in his *Reminiscences of Sixty Years*, I (New York, 1902). Of the secondary accounts, J. F. Rhodes, *History of the United States*, III (New York, 1907 edn.), 305–308, is brief but judicious; J. G. Randall, *Civil War and Reconstruction* (Boston, 1937), pp. 204–206, hews to the usual line, placing the onus of the Convention's failure on the Republicans. Allan Nevins, *Emergence of Lincoln*, II (New York, 1950), 411–412, has nothing new to say about it. Carl Sandburg, *Abraham Lincoln: The War Years*, I (New York, 1942 edn.), 85–90, is fair, but plays the "tired old men" theme.

controversy which now divides the States of this confederacy, shall be satisfactorily adjusted, a permanent dissolution of Union is inevitable," and that this invitation to all the states is "a final effort to restore the Union and the Constitution, in the spirit in which they were established by the fathers of the Republic."

Senator James M. Mason of Virginia, reporting this action to the United States Senate on January 28, 1861, declared "that Virginia has undertaken the office of mediating between the two great sections of the country . . . restoring the Union under guarantees and provisions that might be satisfactory to both." He hoped that the Convention's proposals might "even win back" the six states which had already seceded; but warned that any attempt to coerce them would lead to war.[2]

The Virginia Assembly, to give its proposal added weight, appointed a distinguished delegation, headed by ex-President John Tyler. Other members were William Cabell Rives, a courtly elder statesman, who had read law under Thomas Jefferson and represented the United States at the courts of Louis Philippe and Napoleon III, and James A. Seddon, a forty-five-year-old Richmond lawyer who later became Secretary of War of the Southern Confederacy. As such, he was described by his subordinate Jones, the gossipy "Rebel Clerk," as sallow and cadaverous, resembling "an exhumed corpse after a month's interment."[3] The other Virginia members were George W. Summers of the western part of the state, and Judge John W. Brockenbrough of the federal district court.

Inviting all the states to be represented was not to John Tyler's liking. What he wanted was a convention of the slave states which had not seceded—North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Missouri. He had no hope or expectation of persuading the seceded states to return to the Union, but he felt that a convention limited to slave states which had not seceded could draw up a series of constitutional amendments protecting southern rights as an ultimatum to the free states: i.e., a set of amendments the acceptance of which by the free states would prevent the border slave states from seceding. He knew that the seceded states would not accept membership in the Convention, which without them would have

[2] *Congressional Globe*, 36th Congress, 2nd Session, Part 1, 590.

[3] J. B. Jones, *A Rebel War Clerk's Diary* (Philadelphia, 1866 edn.), 1, 380.

a northern majority; and, as the northern states would probably be represented by Republicans, that would hamstring his strategy.[4] Whether or not John Tyler was a secessionist when the Convention opened, I do not know; but his words and actions prove that his heart was with the Southern Confederacy; and James Seddon, who did most of the talking for Virginia in the Convention, was an old Calhoun man and an avowed secessionist. Their actions remind me strongly of those of Timothy Pickering and John Lowell in respect to the Hartford Convention of 1814, with this important difference, that Pickering and Lowell were not members of the Hartford Convention.

The climate of opinion, when the Peace Convention opened, was favorable to compromise. Opinion in the North was in a state of flux. The secession of the cotton states had not been expected and was regarded with varied feelings. A notion was very prevalent that in electing Lincoln the North had gone too far. A meeting called by the Boston abolitionists on December 8, 1860, to celebrate the anniversary of John Brown's raid, was broken up by a "respectable" mob; and when, a few days later, Wendell Phillips addressed an abolitionist meeting, he had to be hustled home by 100 policemen to escape the attentions of another mob. On February 12, 1861, a monster petition from 182 Massachusetts towns and cities in favor of the Crittenden Compromise, engrossed on a roll three feet wide and as big around as a cartwheel, containing 22,313 signatures, was rolled into the House of Representatives.[5] Equally impressive petitions from other northern states were brought in; two from New York City contained 63,000 signatures. Rhode Island had repealed, and Massachusetts did repeal in March, their personal liberty laws protecting fugitive slaves, which had given great offense to the South. Others were about to do so when the war broke out; Rhodes believed that all would have done so by May 1 "if it had been believed possible to save the Union in this way."[6] During the winter, Senator Seward and Congressman Charles Francis Adams were doing everything in their power to appease Virginia and other border slave states, in order that Lincoln might at least be peacefully inaugurated on March 4.

Former Governor Boutwell, in his reminiscences published over

[4] Lyon G. Tyler, *Letters and Times of the Tylers*, II (Richmond, 1885), 579–582.

[5] Sandburg, *Lincoln: The War Years*, I, 28; Massachusetts Historical Society, *Proceedings*, XLVI (1912–13), 224–225.

[6] Rhodes, *U. S.*, III, 253.

forty years later, seems to bear out President Tyler's apprehensions that if northern states were represented the Convention would come to no good. Boutwell regarded the whole affair as an attempt of secessionists to gain time. He declared that he and his colleagues would have accepted no compromise that did not include an abandonment of the doctrine of secession, an acknowledgment of the legality of Lincoln's election, and a declaration that loyal citizens must support the government. But the debates and the votes prove that only the Massachusetts delegation took this intransigent attitude. A large proportion of the northern delegates were Democrats or former Whigs, strong for compromise, who voted for almost every measure that did not involve an invitation to acquire new slave territory.

James Gordon Bennett's mischievous New York *Herald* declared that the northern delegates were "products of the grog shop" and members of "beaten and broken down factions";[7] but nothing could be further from the truth. Here are some of the more prominent.[8] Maine was represented by Senators William Pitt Fessenden and Lot M. Morrill. New Hampshire sent Amos Tuck, one of the founders of the Republican party in the Granite State. Massachusetts sent former Governor George S. Boutwell, Francis Boardman Crowninshield, who had been speaker of the House, John Murray Forbes, noted China merchant and railroad builder, and John Z. Goodrich of Stockbridge, a former congressman. New York sent a very distinguished delegation, evenly divided between Republicans and non-Republicans, including David Dudley Field, the eminent jurist; James S. Wadsworth of Geneseo; Erastus Corning, four times mayor of Albany, president of the New York Central Railroad, and Democratic representative in Congress; Francis Granger, fifty years out of Yale, and a leader of the conservative "Silver Gray" wing of the Whigs; and William E. Dodge, a wealthy dry goods merchant, speculator, and philanthropist.

An amusing story about an encounter between Dodge and Lincoln is related by Carl Sandburg.[9] Two days before Lincoln arrived in Washington, on February 23, he had no place to go. The committee on arrangements had reserved a suite at the National Hotel on Penn-

[7] Quoted in H. T. Shanks, *The Secession Movement in Virginia* (Richmond, 1934), pp. 169–170.

[8] The complete list is in Chittenden, *Report*, pp. 465–466.

[9] Sandburg, *Lincoln: The War Years*, I, 87–90.

sylvania Avenue and 8th Street. But Mrs. Lincoln put her foot down, refused to stay at the National Hotel because she had heard of an outbreak of ptomaine poisoning there in 1856, which had caused the death of several guests, including Governor Quitman of Mississippi, and had ruined the health of Senator Fessenden. The Willard Hotel, to which Mrs. Lincoln had no objection, was completely filled, and William E. Dodge had the best "parlor suite," on the second floor facing Pennsylvania Avenue. The committee persuaded him to relinquish it to the President-elect. But Dodge made Lincoln pay for this courtesy by forcing himself into the "parlor suite" and telling Lincoln that if he didn't favor a compromise "the grass shall grow in the streets of our commercial cities." Lincoln characteristically replied "If it depends upon me, the grass shall not grow anywhere except in the fields and the meadows."

Rhode Island sent Chief Justice Samuel Ames, Governor William W. Hoppin, and Lieutenant Governor Samuel G. Arnold, the historian of his state; they seldom spoke and voted consistently with the Southern delegations. Connecticut sent Senator Roger S. Baldwin, Governor Chauncey F. Cleveland, and other solid citizens typical of the "Land of Steady Habits." New Jersey sent Governor Peter D. Vroom, Judge Joseph F. Randolph of the Supreme Court, Attorney General Frederick T. Frelinghuysen, and Commodore Robert F. Stockton, one of the most noted naval officers of his day. From Pennsylvania came Governor James Pollock, David Wilmot of Proviso fame, and Attorney General William M. Meredith.

Ohio sent Salmon P. Chase, the future Chief Justice, and the venerable Judge John C. Wright of her Supreme Court, who apparently was so overcome by the honor of being appointed temporary president at the opening session that he up and died. His funeral was held in the Convention's hall, and the oratorical tributes to his memory delivered on that occasion, followed by a procession from the hall to the Baltimore and Ohio depot, consumed an entire day. This episode seems to have confirmed a public impression that the Convention was composed of doddering old men; even Nevins calls the delegates "somewhat superannuated." This is not a fair statement. Naturally the governors and legislatures which appointed delegates chose solid citizens of poise and experience instead of political upstarts and "angry young men"; but that the Convention was not lacking in hormones is proved

by the service of many in the Civil War, the death in battle of at least four delegates,[10] and the political careers of many others after the war was over. John Tyler is also described by some of these writers as aged, emaciated, and tottering; but the portrait of him done that year shows that he still retained the air of an alert patrician, as in Tippecanoe-and-Tyler-too days. The letters of his wife, a Gardiner of Gardiner's Island, New York, indicate that she and her husband were well entertained during the Convention; Stephen A. Douglas even gave a ball for them. Boutwell was only forty-two years old; Seddon, who spoke for the Virginia delegation, was forty-five; and several of the members lived to see the present century.

Indiana sent Caleb B. Smith, a former member of Congress who was about to be appointed Secretary of the Interior by President Lincoln; Illinois sent Judge Stephen T. Logan, who had been Lincoln's law partner; Iowa was represented by Senator James W. Grimes, James Harlan, a future cabinet minister, and Congressman Samuel R. Curtis, a West Pointer and veteran of the Mexican War. As Major General, United States Army, Curtis became the hero of the Battle of Pea Ridge. Kansas sent her territorial chief justice, Thomas Ewing, Jr.

The border slave state delegations were also well chosen, Delaware's alone consisting of nonentities, since apparently no members of the Du Pont family were available. From North Carolina came Governor and Senator David S. Reid, Congressman Thomas Ruffin, and Daniel M. Barringer, former United States minister to Spain. Tennessee sent the largest delegation, of twelve members, including Felix K. Zolicoffer, the future major general, C.S.A. Kentucky was represented by James B. Clay, son of the great Henry, Governor Charles E. Wickliffe, and James Guthrie, who had been Franklin Pierce's secretary of the treasury and in 1861 was president of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad; Guthrie turned out to be the great conciliator of the Convention. Missouri sent Alexander W. Doniphan, veteran of the Mexican War and a stalwart unionist. Maryland had a particularly distinguished delegation, headed by Reverdy Johnson, former attorney general of the United States. It included Augustus W. Bradford, future governor of the state, and two representatives of old

[10] Gen. Zolicoffer, killed at Battle of Fishing Creeks, Ky.; Col. P. A. Hackleman of Indiana, killed at Corinth; Gen. James S. Wadsworth, killed in the Wilderness; Thomas Ruffin, died of wounds in Oct., 1863.

Maryland families: William T. Goldsborough and Benjamin C. Howard, reporter of the Supreme Court of the United States.

There were in all 133 delegates from 21 states. Some of the delegations were appointed by state governors; others by legislatures; Maine and Iowa were represented by their delegations in Congress. The only states not represented were California and Oregon, for reasons of time and distance; the Northwestern states, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, whose governors or legislatures refused the invitation; the seven seceded states, who also refused; and Arkansas and Louisiana, which were on the brink of secession.

Michigan was one of three Northern states which could have sent delegates but did not. After the Convention had been in session a week, the two senators from Michigan were persuaded to ask the state governor to appoint delegates. Senator Zachary Chandler's letter to the governor said, "I hope you will send *stiff-backed* men or none. The whole thing was gotten up against my judgment and advice, and will end in thin smoke. . . . Some of the manufacturing States think that a fight would be awful. Without a little bloodletting this Union will not in my estimation, be worth a rush." This letter leaked out, and was flourished both in the Convention and the Senate as proof of Republican duplicity and intractability.[11] And every secondary account of the Convention features the Chandler letter as a reason for the Convention's failure to accomplish anything. Actually, it seems to have had no influence, and Michigan never sent any delegates. Chandler represented only the radical Republican line, which in the Convention was followed consistently only by the Massachusetts delegation. Other northern delegates who were Republicans, such as Logan of Illinois, Chase of Ohio, and Cleveland of Connecticut, were as conciliatory as anyone in the Convention.

The joint resolutions of most of the state legislatures breathe a spirit of compromise. Those of the border slave states and New Jersey were the most favorable and enthusiastic. Those of the Northern states which had voted for Lincoln took a rather "show me" attitude—Ohio, typically, declared that she was "not prepared" to accept the compromises proposed by Virginia in the invitation, and felt that the Constitution of the United States "contains ample provisions within itself for the correction of all evils complained" of; yet respect for a sister

[11] Rhodes, *U. S.*, III, 307.

state and "a sincere desire to have harmoniously adjusted all differences between us" has persuaded Ohio to send delegates. Indiana and Illinois passed similar resolves, Illinois adding that she considered a new federal convention to be the better way to harmonize sectional difficulties. Pennsylvania intimated that she was ready to accept a stronger fugitive slave law, and to unite with Virginia "in an earnest effort to restore the peace of the country." The General Court of Massachusetts passed a rather dry and non-committal resolution; but its Republican delegation, according to Governor Boutwell, was hostile to compromise from the start.

Let us briefly throw our minds back to that day, when Washington was a straggling mid-century American town of 75,000 people, of whom 11,000 were Negroes, and of them, 3,200 were slaves. Even at that, Washington was too big for its breeches, having grown fifty per cent in the last ten years. Apart from Major l'Enfant's plan, which promised well for the future, the city was completely lacking in distinction. Almost every street was unpaved, horse-drawn busses afforded the only public transportation, the only public buildings were the half-finished Capitol, the unenlarged White House, the Treasury, the Smithsonian, and the Corcoran (now called the Old Court of Claims building) at Pennsylvania Avenue and 17th Street. State, Army, Navy, and Interior were housed in two- and three-story brick buildings that have long since disappeared. Everyone who was anybody lived in or near Lafayette Square, or between it and cosy Georgetown. The incomplete Washington monument, built up to only one-third of its height, and the unfinished dome of the Capitol, surmounted by an unseemly fringe of derricks, seemed symbols of the mess of unfinished business that the spineless Democratic administration had left for Lincoln to tackle. Here is what young Henry Adams thought of our nation's capitol: "As in 1800 and 1850, so in 1860, the same rude colony was camped in the same forest, with the same unfinished Greek temples for work-rooms, and sloughs for roads. The Government had an air of social instability and incompleteness that went far to support the right of secession in theory as in fact; . . . secession was likely to be easy where there was so little to secede from."

The Peace Convention met in Willard's Hall, an old theater adjoining Willard's Hotel which the hotel had acquired. The management placed the hall at the Convention's disposal free of charge, doubt-

less expecting to profit by increased patronage of the nearby bar.

The Convention took itself very seriously. It adopted a set of rules based on those of the Federal Convention of 1787. These required voting by state units, nobody to be allowed to speak more than twice on one question, and sessions to be completely secret. Each session was opened with prayer. Washington, then as now, was a very "leaky" place, and the Drew Pearsons of 1861 had no difficulty in obtaining the gist of what went on for insertion in their columns.

John Tyler, unanimously chosen president, made a gracious speech of acceptance, begging the delegates to prove themselves "worthy of the great occasion." A Committee of Fifteen, composed of one member from each of that number of states, with James Guthrie of Kentucky as chairman, was appointed to propose Constitutional amendments as a basis of discussion.[12] And on February 15, when the Committee of Fifteen reported, the Convention really got down to work.

By that time it was obvious that the Convention could no longer hope to restore "the Union as it was," only to prevent further disintegration. For on February 9 the Confederate States of America had been organized at Montgomery, Alabama, Jefferson Davis chosen President and Alexander H. Stephens Vice-President. On the 16th Davis reached Montgomery after making some twenty-five speeches en route from his home in Mississippi. Upon his arrival he declares that the time for compromise had passed, that southern independence must be maintained, even at the cost of civil war, and that no propositions for a reconstruction of the Union would be entertained.

Here is what the Committee of Fifteen reported in the way of Constitutional amendments:

1. The amendment to which Senator Crittenden of Kentucky had already attached his name, extending the old Missouri Compromise line, 36° 30′, to the California boundary. North of it, slavery to be prohibited, south of it, slavery to be permitted, when under territorial government; states to be admitted from either side of the line with or without slavery as their respective constitutions might determine. This amendment to be irrepealable by subsequent amendment without unanimous consent of the states.

2. No new territory to be acquired by the United States, except by

[12] Chittenden, *Report*, pp. 26–27. The Committee was appointed by President Tyler, and it seems odd that New York, Massachusetts, and Tennessee were not represented on it.

treaty, which "treaty shall be ratified by four-fifths of all members of the Senate." This to be similarly irrepealable except by unanimous consent.

3. The "Never-never" Amendment, as I shall call it for short. Congress shall never abolish, regulate, or control, nor shall any subsequent amendment ever abolish, regulate, or control slavery in any state or territory of the United States, or in the District of Columbia without the consent of Maryland; or even, in that event, to prevent people from slave states bringing slaves into Washington, or to interfere with the interstate slave trade by land or sea.

4. The fugitive slave clause of the Constitution (Article IV, Section ii, §3) to be enforced, against state personal liberty laws.

5. The foreign slave trade to be forever prohibited.

6. In addition to all the above being irrepealable, Article I, Section ii, §3, on the federal ratio of representation, will be irrepealable by future amendment, except by unanimous consent.

7. Congress to provide for compensation to slave owners, the return of whose fugitive slaves is prevented by violence.

That was quite a mouthful for the Northern members of the committee to swallow; and three of them dissented. Roger Baldwin of Connecticut reported as a substitute that Congress summon a full and complete Constitutional convention, as the legislature of Kentucky had already proposed. David Dudley Field and Francis B. Crowninshield, who were not on the committee, promptly expressed their dissent from the committee's report.

The report was equally unsatisfactory to the Virginia delegation, but from an opposite point of view. The Virginia General Assembly, in issuing the call to the Convention, had resolved that the Crittenden Compromise, extending the 36° 30′ line to California, would be acceptable only if it protected slavery in all territory "now held or hereafter acquired" south of this line. Those three words "or hereafter acquired" were really Virginia's ultimatum. They meant, as everyone knew, that slavery could be extended into any future territory, such as Cuba, the northern tier of Mexican states, or Nicaragua, that might be acquired by purchase, filibustering, or war. That demand, as we shall see, was absolutely and completely inacceptable to the northern states; but the Virginia delegation would accept nothing less. James Seddon said so, frankly, to Boutwell, when that head of

the Massachusetts delegation called on him—"We must have new lands." There must have been many unrecorded conversations of this kind among the delegates, and between them and other politicians in Washington. New friendships were made across the borders, and after the war was over Boutwell bestirred himself to have Seddon's disabilities under Amendment XIV removed.[13]

The rigidity of the Virginia attitude became evident when Seddon on February 15 brought in a set of substitute propositions. These, he said, if incorporated as constitutional amendments, would make Virginia feel safe within the Union. Here they are, in brief:

1. The 36° 30′ extension, with the "hereafter acquired" clause.
2. Federal officials within a state to be removed by the President, upon demand of a majority of the senators of either section. I.e., if the objectionable official were in a slave state, a resolution of no confidence by a majority of slave-state senators would be sufficient to throw him out. This extraordinary proposal, which was John Tyler's bright idea,[14] came from the fear that Lincoln would appoint "Black Republican" marshals and district attorneys in the South.
3. Explicit recognition of the right of secession, and prohibition against any form of coercion of a seceded state.

These propositions, significant as they were, never came to a vote.

By February 16 the Convention realized that time was running short. Governor Wickliffe observed that the 36th Congress would end on March 4, and nothing the Convention might recommend would be valid unless adopted by Congress. He proposed to limit all speeches to thirty minutes. Seddon opposed, and the motion was not carried. But one concession was made to the flight of time—the Convention decided to start sessions at 11 A.M. instead of noon.

Samuel R. Curtis of Iowa challenged Seddon on the right of secession. "If any State has the right to go out of the Union at its own volition, then this Government . . . is not worth the trouble of preserving. . . . The Government is one of love and affection, it is true, but it is also one of strength and power. Where was there ever a more indulgent people than ours? Our forts have been taken, our flag has been fired upon, our property seized, and as yet nothing has been done. But . . . beware, gentlemen, how you force them further."

[13] Boutwell, *Reminiscences*, I, 271–272.

[14] Tyler, *Letters and Times*, II, 606.

Reverdy Johnson of Maryland now made an eloquent speech in favor of the 36° 30′ extension, the one amendment that he considered essential to keep the border slave states in the Union. He pointed out that this amendment, restoring the old Missouri Compromise line, would be a Southern concession, since the Supreme Court had declared slavery to be legal in all United States territories north of the line; and since, according to the proposed amendment, territories even south of the line might enter the Union as free states if they chose. He did not allude to the "or hereafter" clause; and Seddon of Virginia, in reply, picked him up on that. Virginia, said Seddon, "insists on the provision for future territory. She and her sister States plant themselves upon it." He also demanded fresh guarantees for the protection of slave property. "We hold our *property*, yes, *our property in slaves*, as rightful and as honorable as any property to be found in the broad expanse between ocean and ocean," said this spokesman for Virginia. It is a matter of honor, "the soul of nations." Without special protection to our property, "we are a dishonored people." "We feel that in the existence, the perpetuity [in slavery, presumably], the protection of the African race, we have a mission to perform, and . . . a duty." He proceeded to glorify the condition of the slaves in the South, as compared with that of the emancipated Negroes in Haiti and Jamaica. He declared that the pernicious doctrine of abolition originated in England, with the express purpose of destroying the American Union, and that the John Brown raid was the logical result of these efforts. He denounced the Republican party as based on "greed of office and power," and animated by "the ruling idea" of using "the whole power of the administration . . . for the final extinction of slavery." And he concluded with an ill-concealed threat that if Virginians were not given the "guarantees which will give them actual power instead of mere paper rights," the state convention, then sitting at Richmond, would vote for secession.

I wish that some of our evasive historians, our mufflers of great passionate issues, who are trying to persuade the American public that Negro slavery had nothing to do with the Civil War, would read the debates in this Peace Convention. There is no suggestion in any of the Southern delegates' speeches of any grievance against the North, or against the Republican party, other than hostility to slavery. Tariff, internal improvements, all those trumped-up issues which were the

grist of Confederate propaganda then, and since, were never even mentioned. It is interesting to note that while Seddon was orating at Washington, H. L. Benning of Georgia appeared before the Virginia Convention at Richmond as envoy of the Confederate States, offering Virginia, if she would join the Southern Confederacy, to pass a protective tariff and build up manufacturing to make her "the New England of the South."[15] States' rights are indeed frequently mentioned in the Convention debates, but only as a justification for preserving slavery.

Former Governor Boutwell was selected by the Massachusetts delegation and by the Republicans of the New York delegation to reply to Seddon. "Massachusetts," he observed, "has made war upon slavery wherever she had a right to do it; but much as she *abhors* the institution, she would sacrifice anything rather than assail it when she has not the right to assail it"—i.e., in the states that have it. A President has been elected "in a legal and constitutional way." Do the Southern gentlemen mean to suggest that his inauguration will not be permitted unless these guarantees to slavery be adopted? If the Union "cannot be preserved . . . without these new guarantees for slavery," he believes "that the Union is not worth preserving." He is ready to admit that, owing to the Dred Scott decision, slavery now legally exists in all United States territories. And he disapproves all restriction on the acquisition of new territory; "the Canadas" may wish to join the United States. He does not think that the Northern States will ever "consent to these new endorsements of an institution which they do not like, which they believe to be injurious to the best interests of the Republic. . . . But the North will never consent to the separation of the States. If the South persists in the course on which she has entered we shall march our armies to the Gulf of Mexico, or you will march yours to the Great Lakes. There can be no peaceful separation." Boutwell later remembered that when he said this, tears started from the eyes of William Cabell Rives.

Boutwell's statement that Massachusetts "abhors" slavery stirred up bad blood, which shows how far the South had moved in the previous generation. Washington detested slavery, Jefferson abhorred slavery, and George Mason in the Federal Convention denounced slavery; but, by 1860, for anyone to admit that he or his state "ab-

[15] Shanks, *Secession Movement*, pp. 161–162.

horred" slavery was an argument for secession. Boutwell himself records that it "grieved" the Southern members "sorely" and that some tried to persuade him "to retract or qualify it."[16] Boutwell would have done better to say that Massachusetts "regrets" slavery—not that it made any difference in the end.

James Guthrie followed with a conciliatory speech. This Kentuckian, one of the few members of the Convention who was more businessman than politician, showed the nearest approach to statesmanship of any, except possibly Reverdy Johnson of Maryland. Governor Cleveland of Connecticut begged for an end to sectional recriminations. "Let us be gentle and pleasant. Let us love one another. Let us not try to find out who is the smartest or keenest. Let us vote soon, and without any feeling or any quarrelling."

An effort was now made on motion of George Davis of North Carolina to cut down the length of speeches to ten minutes, and to bring the proposed amendments to a vote. This proposal to choke off the flow of oratory, so contrary to the habits of that era, was vigorously opposed. William E. Dodge protested that he wished "to speak for the commercial interests of the country," and "cannot do them justice in ten minutes." The debate whether or not to apply the snuffer consumed an entire day, during which Commodore Stockton gave a speech that must have taken at least an hour to deliver. He invoked the memory of Quintus Curtius (meaning, I suppose, the legendary Marcus Curtius who leaped into the chasm to save Rome), reviewed the English Civil War and the entire expanse of American history, and predicted that "the use of the sword to conquer secession" was an infatuation—"Why, you cannot force New Jersey alone!"[17] The venerable Francis Granger of New York delivered a long and conciliatory speech in favor of the amendments, concluding with an eloquent plea for union. William Cabell Rives of Virginia followed, declaring "I condemn the secession of States. I am not here to justify it. I detest it. But the great fact is still before us.... With this fact the nation must deal.... Coercion is not a word to be used in this connection. There must be negotiation. Virginia presents herself as a mediator to bring back those who have left us." Rives was the only delegate who clung to

[16] Boutwell, *Reminiscences*, I, 273.

[17] New Jersey, last of the Northern states to start emancipation of the slaves, still had eighteen slaves in 1860, and the sympathetic attitude of this delegation raised an expectation that she might join the Southern Confederacy if Maryland and Delaware did.

the hope of bringing the "wayward sisters" back; for the others, it was only a question of finding guarantees to prevent the other slave states from joining them. Rives, in reply to Boutwell's "abhorrence" of slavery, taunted him with the charge that Massachusetts had "fastened" slavery on the South against its will, in order to profit from the slave trade—a hoary myth still widely believed in the South.

Governor Morrill of Maine tried to bring the Convention back to reality by asking, "What will Virginia do? How does Virginia stand? She to-day holds the keys of peace or war. . . . She undertakes to dictate the terms upon which the Union is to be preserved. What will satisfy her?" Seddon replied, "Virginia *will not permit coercion*," but he would not be drawn into giving an opinion as to whether or not his proposed amendments would keep her in the Union. George W. Summers of the Virginia delegation, who represented Kanawha County, accepted the challenge from Down East, and gave it as his opinion that Virginia would accept the amendments proposed by the Committee as satisfactory; he made a touching plea to the New England members "not to refuse us the little boon we ask, when the consequences of that refusal must be so awful." He declared he would "*never give up the Union*," nor did he. After making an eloquent plea for union in the Virginia Convention at Richmond, George Summers helped to organize the State of West Virginia.

The motion to limit speeches to ten minutes did not come up until next day, when it was defeated; and the rumble of high-caliber oratory was resumed.

Of all the speeches made before the final vote, the only one that said anything new, or anything old in a new way, was by David Dudley Field of New York. This speech confirms what I have been told by a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, that Field was one of the greatest of American jurists, in a class with Chancellor Kent and Judge Story. He pointed out, on the authority of President Buchanan, that Congress had never passed a law concerning slavery that the South thought unconstitutional, except the Missouri Compromise, which had been repealed. President-elect Lincoln has given every assurance that the Republican administration will not interfere with slavery in the States. "Can you not be satisfied with that? No. You propose these amendments in advance. You insist upon them. . . . But, gentlemen of the South, what reasons do you give for entering upon this hasty,

this precipitate action? You say it is the prevailing sense of insecurity, the anxiety, the apprehension you feel lest something unlawful . . . may be done. Yet the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SEDDON) tells us that Virginia is able to protect all who reside within her limits, and that she will do so at all hazards. Why not tell us the truth outright? . . . You are determined to prevent the agitation of the subject. . . . You have called us here to prevent future discussion of . . . slavery. It is *that* you fear—it is *that* you would avoid—discussion in Congress—in the State Legislatures—in the newspapers—in popular assemblies." And he went on to say that the proposed amendments would not accomplish this end; rather they, especially the one to enforce the Fugitive Slave Law, would be "throwing a lighted firebrand . . . into every county, city, and village" in the land. He declared, "I would sacrifice all I have; lay down my life for the Union. But I will not give these guarantees to slavery." And, by way of peroration, he closed with the famous quotation from Longfellow's "Launching of the Ship."

Field certainly went to the root of the matter, but that was not the way to conciliate. Judge Thomas White of the Pennsylvania delegation followed him with a plea for speedy action in favor of the proposed amendments, which he regarded as advantageous to the North. Frelinghuysen of New Jersey also spoke in favor of them. William E. Dodge finally got his chance to speak "as a plain merchant" for the businessmen of New York City. He allowed that he was "accustomed to the trials, vexations, cares, and responsibilities of business," but this situation was worse than anything he had experienced: last night he "could not close" his "eyes in slumber" because of the "certain and inevitable ruin" that is threatening business. In New York City, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Boston, business is stagnant; goods are not moving from the shelves, customers are scarce, shop clerks "sit around in idleness reading the newspapers"; in New England "the noise of the loom, the rattle of the shuttle" have ceased, and all because of sectional misunderstanding. The New England delegates misunderstood their own people in opposing Mr. Seddon's propositions. The Yankees "are a shrewd and calculating as well as an enterprising people"; they will go for these amendments if they understand the necessity of them to save their section from ruin.

And so the debate went on, with amendments and counter-amend-

ments. There was very little sectional recrimination—far less than in congressional debates, because the delegates were there to find a compromise, and because they had no audience other than themselves. On February 23 the delegates were received by President Lincoln in the parlor suite relinquished by Mr. Dodge; and William Cabell Rives, at least, was impressed. He wrote home that this President-elect was a real man, who was not going to be run by any abolitionist clique and that he could find no fault with his views as then expressed.[18]

On February 26 matters finally came to a head. Seddon, who did almost all the speaking for the Virginia delegation, brought in a fresh set of proposed amendments, which, he said, embodied the Crittenden resolutions, with such alterations as the Virginia delegation had been "instructed to insist upon." They were as follows:

1. Extension of the 36° 30′ line, with the "hereafter acquired" words inserted, that would extend slavery to future acquisitions south of the line.

2. and 3. The "Never-never" Amendment about slavery in the states, and in the District of Columbia.

4. Congress to have no power to interfere with the domestic slave trade, and the right of transit of slaves through free states to be protected.

5. Compensation to owners of fugitive slaves when their return has been prevented by state law or force.

6. All the above amendments, and also Article I, Section ii, §3, to be irrepealable except by unanimous consent of the states.

7. People of Negro blood to be ineligible for the franchise, whether federal, state, or municipal.

To these proposed amendments were added resolutions as a guide to congressional and state action:

1. The states are "respectfully and earnestly" recommended to repeal their personal liberty laws.

2. The Fugitive Slave Act to be strengthened and enforced.

3. Laws for the suppression of the African slave trade to be made more effectual.

The Seddon substitutes were emphatically rejected, only Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, and Missouri voting for them. Clay of

[18] Sandburg, *Lincoln: The War Years*, I, 90.

Kentucky then brought in a somewhat modified set of Seddon resolves, which was defeated by a similar vote, only Tennessee joining the four states in favor.

Amos Tuck of New Hampshire now brought in a completely different set of resolutions, embodying the "Never-never" Amendment, plus non-recognition of the right of secession. This was eloquently argued for by Salmon P. Chase. But it received the votes of nine states only—all Northern; with eleven states, including New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island, against.

It was clear that the Convention was deadlocked. There was a general wringing of hands. Commodore Stockton again evoked the history of ancient Rome. "Alas! Is there no Curtius here" to throw himself into the chasm and sacrifice his life to save his country?

Well, there was—just one; James Guthrie of Kentucky, and it was his propositions, amended, which came up for the final vote on February 26–27:

1. The Crittenden 36° 30′ amendment. When this came to a vote it was defeated, eight states to eleven, and not by sectional alignment. Four free states—New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island —voted for it, three slave states, Virginia, North Carolina, and Missouri helped defeat it, obviously because it lacked the "or hereafter" clause.

This was the crisis of the Convention. The border state men "were sorely disappointed, and some of them wept like children," remembered Boutwell. "The disagreeable silence which followed the announcement of the vote, was broken by Mr. Francis Granger, who" counselled moderation and moved to reconsider.[19] His motion was adopted, fourteen states to five, and Guthrie brought up the amendment again next morning, when it was adopted, nine states to eight. Illinois was the state that changed its vote in favor; a deadlock in the New York and Missouri delegations reduced the opposing states to eight.

Thus, the 36° 30′ extension, without the "or hereafter" clause, was adopted.

[19] Boutwell, *Reminiscences*, I, 274. Boutwell said that the reconsideration was attributed to the influence of Lincoln, but there is no evidence that he intervened in any way in the deliberations of the Convention.

The next proposition to come to a vote, No. 2, was to the effect that no new territory could be acquired without the concurrence of a majority of the senators from the slave states, and a majority of those of the free states. This was adopted, eleven states to eight, all the slave state delegations except North Carolina's voting for it; five New England states, Illinois, and Iowa against it.

3. The "Never-never" Amendment, as to slavery in the states, or the District of Columbia, or interfering with the domestic slave trade. Adopted, twelve states to seven, only five New England states, Indiana, and Iowa in the minority.

4. Enforcing the fugitive slave clause of the Constitution, Article IV, Section ii, §3. Adopted, fifteen states to four; Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Iowa in the minority.

5. Foreign slave trade forever prohibited, and the prohibition extended to "coolies" and contract labor. Adopted, sixteen states to five; Virginia, North Carolina, Iowa, Maine, and Massachusetts in the minority.

6. The above amendments Numbers 1, 3, and 5, plus the federal ratio clause (Article I, Section ii, §3) and the fugitive slave clause (Article IV, Section ii, §3) of the Constitution to be irrepealable save by unanimous consent of all the states. Passed, eleven states to nine. Virginia, North Carolina, Indiana, Iowa, and five New England constituted the minority.

7. Compensation for fugitive slaves. Passed twelve states to seven, Virginia, North Carolina, Missouri, Iowa, and three New England states in the minority.

Obviously, this was far from a clean-cut vote. The New York delegation was divided fifty-fifty, between its Republican and non-Republican members, on every one of the seven propositions. Kansas was divided on three. Virginia's vote was cast by a three to two majority within her delegation. And after every vote several members spoke up dissociating themselves from the vote of their respective states. But the seven propositions were adopted by the Convention, and by it presented as Amendment XIII to the Constitution, to the 36th Congress, which had but a few more days of life.

Note that the Maine, Massachusetts, and Iowa delegations voted against everything, and that they were joined by New Hampshire, Vermont, and Connecticut in voting against the 36° 30′ amendment,

the "Never-never" Amendment, and the one making these amendments irrepealable. If these delegations accurately represented the sentiment of their states, there was little chance of getting the seven proposed amendments adopted.

But the really significant thing in the vote is that of Virginia. Her delegation, supported except in one instance by that of North Carolina, voted against four of the seven propositions, including the crucial 36° 30′ one. Since Virginia had initiated the Convention, and since the principal object of it was to give Virginia and the other border states guarantees which would enable their union men to triumph over the secessionists, this negative attitude of the Virginia delegation meant that the Convention's labors were in vain.

President Tyler himself immediately made this clear. On February 28, the day after the Convention adjourned, he made a public speech from the steps of the Exchange Hotel at Richmond openly advocating the secession of his state.[20] Seddon did likewise, and both took seats in the Virginia Convention and assumed leadership of the secessionists. Summers alone of the Virginia delegation maintained a firm opposition to secession.

The surprising thing in the vote is the unanimous affirmative of all slave states except North Carolina for the concurrent majority provision for annexing new territory; for it would have given a majority of free-state senators the right to block the annexation of Cuba, or other slave territory to the southward. Possibly Governor Boutwell's insinuation of a future annexation of Canada, which would have meant at least four new free states, prompted this vote.

The fate of the Convention's amendments in the Senate, to which they were presented on February 27, is equally significant. Senator Crittenden, "the Nestor of the Senate," who had represented Kentucky there at intervals for forty-four years, promptly accepted the proposed Amendment XIII as a substitute for the propositions for which he had been laboring since Lincoln's election. But the amendment was strongly opposed by both senators from Virginia, Mason and Hunter.[21]

Senator Seward of New York proposed to substitute a call for a new federal Constitutional convention. Senator Hunter endeavored in vain

[20] Tyler, *Letters and Times*, II, 616.

[21] *Ibid.*, II, 608.

to bring back the "hereafter acquired" proviso in the 36° 30′ section.[22] The whole subject was thrashed out in the Senate on that and the next few days, and also in the House.

The only part of the Peace Convention's recommendation to survive the 4th of March was the "Never-never" Amendment, forever protecting slavery in the states and the District of Columbia from congressional interference. The Republicans were willing to accept this, since in the Chicago platform of 1860 they had disclaimed any right or intention to interfere with slavery in the states, and President Lincoln had repeatedly stated that he had no objection to it. Lincoln made a clean-cut distinction between assurance and appeasement. He was willing to give the South assurance that his party would not meddle with slavery in the states, but he felt that appeasement of the South on slavery extension and fugitive slaves, which had been actively pursued by the Democratic party since 1850, had been a failure, and that his election was the result of a popular protest against it. So he would support no amendment that allowed further extension of slavery.

The "Never-never" Amendment, in substantially the same form that it issued from the Peace Convention, was adopted on February 28 by the House of Representatives by a vote of 133 to 65 (Charles Francis Adams and many other Republicans voting in favor)[23] and by the Senate by 24 to 12—the exact constitutional majority of two-thirds —on March 3, 1861. The same day it received the unnecessary approval of President Buchanan.[24] This amendment was actually ratified by three states—by Ohio on May 13, 1861, and by Maryland on January 10, 1862, and by Illinois on February 14, 1862.

In conclusion, the Peace Convention was held as a result of a sincere desire on the part of the Virginia General Assembly, not only to find guarantees for slavery where it existed, and so stifle the secession movement, but to woo the seceded states back into the Union. Although the second object was seen to be irrealizable a few days after the Convention met, the first was persisted in through almost three weeks of committee work and debate. It failed because the Virginia delegation, dominated by President Tyler and Seddon, refused to

[22] Chittenden, *Report*, p. 482. Chittenden here prints the Senate proceedings as an appendix.

[23] *Cong. Globe*, 36th Cong., 2nd Sess., Pt. II, 1263, 1284.

[24] Herman V. Ames, *Proposed Amendments to the Constitution*, American Historical Association, *Annual Report, 1896*, II (1897), 196, 363. Allan Nevins (*Emergence of Lincoln*, II, 401) states that an amendment similar to the Convention's No. 4, outlawing personal liberty laws, passed the House Feb. 27 by a vote of 137–53.

abate two demands made at the very start. The first was to the effect that the 36° 30′ compromise line between freedom and slavery in the territories must allow for acquiring new slave territory to the southward. The second was a recognition of the right of secession. Virginia did obtain approval by the Convention of the "Never-never" Amendment, of the dual provision for acquiring new territory, and of a stronger fugitive slave law; but these did not satisfy her leading public men as effective guarantees.

I agree with James Ford Rhodes, that "the historical significance of the Peace Convention consists in the evidence it affords of the attachment of the border slave States to the Union, and the lingering hope of readjustment in North Carolina and Tennessee."[25] But was not the conflict, by that time, irrepressible? Could anything short of a change of heart in the South, to regard slavery as something to be eventually liquidated, or on the part of the North, wholeheartedly to suppress criticism of slavery, have prevented the Civil War? President Lincoln and the Republicans had been given a clear mandate to allow no further extension of slave territory. They were willing to admit new slave states south of the old 36° 30′ line, since the Dred Scott decision had already declared slavery to be legal in that region. They were willing to accept the "Never-never" Amendment; but beyond that, as Lincoln insisted, they held firm.[26]

James B. McKean of Saratoga Springs, New York, a member of Congress not otherwise known to fame, hit the nail on the head when, discussing the 36° 30′ amendment with the "hereafter acquired" clause, he remarked:

> Whenever a party shall be beaten in an election for President and Vice President, such party may rebel and take up arms, and, unless the successful shall adopt as its own the principles of the defeated party, and consent to such amendments of the Constitution as the latter party shall dictate, then, in such case, the Union shall be at an end.[27]

Governor Boutwell was no compromiser, and in his reminiscences he states why. "Conspirators are never disposed to make terms with

[25] Rhodes, *U. S.*, III, 307–308.

[26] See the interesting discussion in Nevins, *Emergence of Lincoln*, II, 407–409, and Martin Duberman, *Charles Francis Adams* (Boston, 1961), pp. 232–243, of Adams' attempts to appease the South by admitting New Mexico as a slave state.

[27] *Cong. Globe*, 36th Cong., 2nd Sess., Pt. II, Appendix, p. 222. Andrew C. McLaughlin quoted this in his review of Rhodes's Vol. III in *American Historical Review*, I (1896), 368, but named the speaker incorrectly McLean.

the party against whom their conspiracy is aimed, until the conspiracy has failed."[28] Note how aptly this applies to the negotiations with Hitler before World War II, and to our frequent attempts to come to terms with Russia. I would not attach the invidious term "conspiracy" to the Southern secessionists, who had been working in the open for years, or compare the honorable Jefferson Davis to Adolf Hitler. But it seems clear, after a century has elapsed, that what Stephen Vincent Benét called the "purple dream" of an empire based on slavery, extending into the Caribbean, was so enticing, and so apparently attainable, that no manner of appeasement on the part of the free states and the Republican party could have stopped the Southern Confederacy in 1861. And it is transparently clear that nothing short of acquiescence in this dismemberment of the Union could have prevented the secession of Virginia.

[28] Boutwell, *Reminiscences*, I, 272.

Some Experiences of My Political Life

Henry L. Shattuck*

My first venture in politics was to announce my candidacy for a vacancy on the Boston Common Council for Ward 11 (now Ward 5) at the election of 1908.

This announcement was followed by a call from a Republican Ward Committeeman who told me that my college classmate, the late Courtenay Crocker, had been picked out by the Committee for the place. He had already made some position for himself in politics. The result was that I withdrew, and was shortly thereafter elected to the Ward Committee, and assured that I would have the Committee's support the next time. Unfortunately there was no next time as the Common Council was abolished by the revised Charter of 1909, which provided for a Mayor and a City Council of nine elected at large.

My next venture was to run for the Constitutional Convention at the special election in May, 1917. There were four candidates for two places, namely: Henry Parkman, Sr., an elder statesman of the Republican Party; Arthur E. Burr, a member of the House of Representatives; our former Member the late Charles P. Curtis, then a law student; and myself. Everyone knew that Henry Parkman was a sure winner. In consequence it was a three-man fight for the second place. I was busy practising law and did little except to send out a pre-election post card.

Curtis' father, Charles P. Curtis, Sr., however, went all out for his son by personal appeals and enlisting the help of Martin Lomasney, with whom he had become acquainted when a member of the Boston Police Commission. Lomasney took off his coat for Curtis, Jr., even sending out to Jewish voters a circular in Yiddish. At that time I was unknown to Lomasney. Curtis won; I came next; and Burr last.

At the State election of 1919 I was once more a candidate, this time for the House of Representatives, then (and for the last time) a one-year term. Subsequently I was re-elected for five successive two-year terms, through 1930.

In 1920 Calvin Coolidge was serving his last year as Governor;

* A modified version of this address was given at the Annual Dinner of the Massachusetts Historical Society on October 19, 1961.

Joseph E. Warner was Speaker; B. Loring Young, Majority Leader; and Frank Lyman, of Easthampton, Chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means. I was appointed to this Committee and served continuously through 1930, and as Chairman from 1923 to 1929. I was succeeded by Arthur W. Jones, of Nantucket. He died within a year or so and was, in turn, succeeded by the late Albert F. Bigelow, of Brookline, a former President of this Society. Bigelow served with distinction during the difficult Depression years of the 1930's.

The subsequent Governors under whom I served in this period were Channing H. Cox, Alvan T. Fuller, and Frank G. Allen.

Having been chosen Treasurer of Harvard in March, 1929, I completed my term but did not run again. Before announcing my intention not to run, I looked about for a strong candidate and found one in Christian A. Herter. I then announced that I was retiring and that he would run to fill the vacancy. Needless to say, he was elected handily.

In 1933 the only candidates from my Ward (then numbered 5) for the Boston City Council—consisting (pursuant to a further revision of the Charter) of one Councilman from each of the twenty-two Wards—appeared to me unqualified. Therefore, I announced my candidacy and was elected for the two-year term and, subsequently, for three more two-year terms covering the period from 1934 to 1941.

In 1942 Herter, who had been serving in the House since my retirement and as Speaker for the years 1939-1942, announced his candidacy for Congress, and George A. Parker, the other member of Ward 5, was not a candidate for re-election. We had difficulty in finding suitable candidates to fill these vacancies. Finally, the late Stuart C. Rand said that he would run if I would. I did, and we both were elected. I was subsequently re-elected for two more terms of two years, serving from 1943 to 1948. I was a member of the Committee on Public Service, and from 1943 to 1946 was House Chairman of that Committee. During this time the Governors were Leverett Saltonstall (1943-1944), Maurice J. Tobin (1945-1946), and Robert F. Bradford (1947-1948). With the close of 1948 I ended twenty-five years of legislative and City Council service.

I have never subsequently been a candidate for elective public office. I have however held appointive public offices as a member of the Loyalty Review Board under the U. S. Civil Service Commis-

sion from 1947 to 1953, and as Chairman of the Interim Mixed Parole and Clemency Board for German War Criminals from 1953 to 1954. I still hold Party office as a member of the Ward 5 (formerly Wards 11 and 8) Republican Committee.

Of my many experiences in State and city government, I have selected a few by way of illustration.

The Coolidge Budget of 1920

Governor Coolidge in his budget, wishing to limit the tax apportioned on the cities and towns to $12,000,000, included in the estimates of receipts to support it the proceeds of the sale to the Federal Government of the South Boston dry dock in the amounts of $3,107,366.93. He also included an alleged surplus of $800,000 in the sinking funds.

This was the subject of sharp debate in the House Committee on Ways and Means. Finally, by a bare majority, the Committee voted to ask the Governor to revise his budget by omitting the dry dock and sinking fund items. I was one of a committee of three who called on the Governor to advise him of this action. We pointed out that bonds were still outstanding for the construction of the dry dock, and that the money received from the Federal Government should not be regarded as a current receipt, and that there was danger in monkeying with sinking funds. The Governor listened to us and said nothing, but very soon after that he submitted a revised budget omitting from the estimated receipts the dry dock item and the proposed transfer from the sinking fund, and raising the recommended State tax from $12,000,000 to $14,000,000 and providing for a special tax of one-half of 1% on domestic corporation income. In the result, sound budget practice was maintained.

Apportionment of the Cost of the World War I Memorial Bridge over the Connecticut River at Springfield

The cost of the bridge had been apportioned by a Commission appointed by the Supreme Judicial Court. The major portion was apportioned to Springfield, and smaller portions to Holyoke, West Springfield, and other governmental units. Holyoke was dissatisfied with its apportionment and in 1921 brought a bill into the legislature

to revise the apportionment made by the Supreme Court Commission.

The House was nearly evenly divided on the question, and both sides claimed a majority. Speaker Young, taking the floor, led the fight to stand by the Court apportionment and to defeat the bill.

At 6 P.M. the vote was taken, and the bill was defeated 108-102. In order to close the matter we had reconsideration moved.

Desperate attempts were made to adjourn or postpone. The game was to get some of our convivially inclined supporters to the theater, where seats had been engaged, and to entertain them so well that they would never turn up when the session was resumed in the evening. We defeated postponement. We then defeated reconsideration. This killed the bill, and at 6:55 P.M. we granted a recess. We were no longer concerned if our friends did go on a bat.

This incident was reminiscent of the "Woodchuck Session" of the New Hampshire legislature described by Winston Churchill, the American author, in *Coniston,* his novel of New Hampshire politics.

Mayor Curley's Proposal for a World War Memorial Bridge to Replace the Harvard Bridge, 1923-1924

Mayor Curley, claiming that the Harvard Bridge was in danger of falling down, put in a bill for a World War Memorial Bridge to replace it, at a cost of about $6,000,000.

Loring Young, who was then Speaker of the House, questioned this, and at his suggestion I filed a Resolve for investigation. This was adopted (Resolves 1923, Chapter 47) in substitution for the bridge bill.

In the meantime, I interviewed the bridge engineer of the Boston Public Works Department. He showed me his report to the Mayor, concluding not that the bridge was falling down but that it was a little shaky and would not stand a heavier pavement, and that it could be strengthened. The following year, the report made pursuant to the Resolve confirmed this conclusion, and an Act was passed (Acts 1924, Chapter 442) for the strengthening, repavement, and repair of the bridge, and the elimination of the draw span, all at a cost not exceeding $600,000. This was done, and now, nearly forty years later, the bridge still stands and serves its purpose. Incidentally, over $5,000,000 was saved.

Not everyone was satisfied, however. Some time later I received

a letter from the late R. Clipston Sturgis (one of my constituents) protesting my part in defeating the Curley proposal. I replied that often after rowing at the Union Boat Club I walked home along the Charles River and, looking over the low-lying and unobtrusive Harvard Bridge, I could see the sunset and the hills beyond, much of which might be cut off by a monumental bridge. In reply, he wrote me that as a layman I had no right to express an opinion on an aesthetic subject and that such opinions were only for architects and artists. One cannot satisfy everyone.

Reciprocal or Inter-Insurance: A Case in Which the Lobby Overplayed its Hand

Reciprocal or inter-insurance was originated in the State of Missouri during the corrupt Pendergast days. Under this scheme, insurance was issued through an attorney in fact. There was no capital behind it, and at the start there were no reserves. It was said to be desired by department stores and other large insurers of stock-in-trade as a supplement to the insurance carried in standard-type companies. Its only merit was that until losses were incurred it was cheap. Governor Cox, in his Inaugural Address of 1924, recommended favorable legislation. The matter was referred to the Joint Committee on Insurance. A hearing was held by the Committee and a bill reported in the Senate (S. 490) to carry out the Governor's recommendation. After debate and several roll calls, the bill was passed by the Senate and sent down to the House. Under the rules it was referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means, of which I was Chairman.

Robert J. Bottomly, onetime secretary of the now defunct Good Government Association and then a lobbyist for whom I had no respect, was back of the bill. It was believed that if the bill were enacted he would organize a Reciprocal and become its attorney in fact. The bill was also supported by life insurance companies, the attorney for one of them admitting that his company had been threatened with loss of its license in Missouri if it failed to lend its support.

At the time the Ways and Means Committee received the bill, the session was nearing its end. Notwithstanding pressure, I insisted on holding a hearing and spent most of the preceding night preparing for it by close study of the bill and by drafting a long list of questions designed to expose its objectionable features.

When the hearing opened the next day, instead of calling first on the proponents, as was usual, I put the Commissioner of Insurance on the stand. I pointed out that the bill was very complicated, and asked him to explain it, and fired my questions at him. When this was over and the proponents were called, their case was so damaged that they were thrown completely off balance.

After the hearing, while at an executive session of Ways and Means, I was called to the Governor's office. He told me that at a gathering of political figures the previous evening he had heard that a Boston newspaper (the now defunct *Telegram*, I believe) was coming out with an attack on me, claiming that as a Director of the New England Trust Company, which was depositary of the securities of the Employers Liability Assurance Corporation, I was opposing the bill at the request of the Employers. I told the Governor that I had had no knowledge as to whether they wanted or did not want the bill and that I intended to continue my opposition. I felt that I had been threatened. Returning to the Committee room, I told my colleagues what had taken place. They also felt that I had been threatened. The news soon spread through the corridors. The bill was dead. The lobby had overplayed its hand.

In substitution for the bill we reported a Resolve for a recess committee to study the question. This committee, with several dissenters, recommended at the next session a considerably strengthened bill, which, however, failed to pass. Another try was made in the following year, which also ended in failure.

Incidentally, when Alvan Fuller was Governor and Malcolm Nichols was Mayor of Boston, Fuller described Bottomly, the late Charles H. Innes, and Ernest J. Goulston as the morning, afternoon, and evening mayors. On the underworlds of politics Governor Fuller and I saw eye to eye.

The Bill for Licensing Chiropractors: An Example of the Oblique Attack When too Weak for a Frontal Attack

It was proposed in this bill to license chiropractors on the passing of examinations fitted to their limited training.

The bill had already been reported favorably by the Committee on Public Health and came to the Ways and Means Committee, of which

I was then Chairman, by reason of the fact that its administration, if enacted, would entail some expense on the part of the State.

I felt that the regular State Board examinations and standards should be applied to all persons licensed to pursue the healing art. However, the bill had strong supporters, and a strong lobby behind it. Many states had adopted similar laws, and chiropractic had a wide appeal. The success of a direct attack by an "Ought Not to Pass" seemed to me doubtful. I decided, therefore, upon an oblique attack. Burning midnight oil, I rewrote the bill, putting into it requirements similar to those of the State Board, and reported in a new draft a bill to license chiropractors.

When my doctor friends heard of this they were astounded, but not for long. My substitute came on the floor for debate. The supporters of the chiropractors fought it bitterly. No chiropractor could possibly meet the requirements. They killed my bill as I expected but so exposed the weakness of their own cause that they could not get the votes to substitute their own bill. My oblique attack succeeded, as planned.

Mental Hospitals: A Visit with Governor Fuller to the Danvers State Hospital

The appropriations for these hospitals, next to those for the Department of Public Works, involved the largest State expense. It was big business. The patients numbered about one-half of 1% of the total population. We spent much time in the Ways and Means Committee studying the requirements of the Department for maintenance and new construction. And one summer I visited every one of the hospitals and went over most of the buildings from cellar to roof.

Dr. L. Vernon Briggs was much concerned about overcrowding, and he suggested that a visit be made at night to one of the hospitals, when the patients were in bed. I put this up to Governor Fuller, and a few days later he invited me and Dr. Kline, the Commissioner, for dinner at his Beacon Street house. From there we motored to Danvers on a surprise visit. It was a cold winter night, and in the icy ruts we almost went off the Beverly bridge. We arrived just after the patients were leaving a movie and getting into bed. We saw many temporary cots between the beds, some of them in very poor condition. Governor Fuller was shocked. The next year he put in his budget an

appropriation for the Metropolitan Hospital in Waltham, the first wholly new mental hospital which had been built for years.

Another step to improve conditions made at about this time was an appropriation for research into the causes and treatment of mental disease. This was the first such appropriation made by the State in an area of medicine very much neglected up to that time.

Senator Walter McLane, Governor Fuller, and the Chocolates

I was closer to Fuller than to any other Governor. We did not always agree, but I admired his courage and complete integrity.

On the last day of one of the legislative sessions in the middle 1920's, I was sitting in Governor Fuller's office while he was signing and vetoing bills. One of those vetoed was sponsored by Senator Walter E. McLane of Fall River. It was a Resolve to pay a sum of money to a Fall River policeman who had been kicked by a horse while allegedly on duty. The Governor was convinced that the policeman was not on duty and, accordingly, vetoed the bill and transmitted his veto to the Senate. The Governor then sent for a page boy. He handed the page a candy box, in which there remained one chocolate peppermint, and put the pen with which he had signed the veto in the box, and said to the boy, "Take this to Senator McLane with my compliments." The Senator, who ordinarily had a great sense of humor, was not amused.

During much of my service as Chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, Senator McLane was Chairman of the Senate Committee. Some measures were referred to the two Committees, sitting jointly, and on these we had joint hearings and joined in the report. Senator McLane was an obstructive influence. His technique was to get the Committee laughing so hard at his funny stories that they became maudlin, and orderly consideration was impossible. Fortunately the Senator was frequently absent. He was a devious and clever politician. I did not respect him, but I had a certain liking for him. In 1921 I served on a committee which involved the Senator and members of his family in certain scandals connected with street railway legislation. Notwithstanding this, his outward demeanor toward me, when we were later associated on the Joint Committee on Ways and Means, was always courteous and considerate.

Mr. Marquand and H. M. Pulham, Esquire

Soon after Marquand's novel *H. M. Pulham, Esquire* was published, it was the subject of a sharp attack by Cardinal O'Connell. This attack was followed up in the Boston City Council by Councilman Maurice H. Sullivan of Brighton. He offered an order condemning the book as "disrespectful to Boston womanhood." Such orders have no force of law and are customarily passed on request of the sponsoring member without debate. I had not read the book, was not prepared to comment, and did not consider the matter of any great consequence. Therefore, I did not rise to object. Later, a reporter got hold of me, and I made a statement to this effect, which he published. Not long after I received an indignant and humorless letter from Marquand. In reply I told him of the nonchalant way in which the Council did such things and suggested that the principal effect of the order might be to help sell his book. I invited him to call on us at one of our sessions and see for himself how we did things. He never did.

A year or two later I ran into Mr. Metcalf, the Harvard Librarian. He told me that he had asked Marquand for the manuscript of *H. M. Pulham, Esquire,* and Marquand had refused to give it, saying that I had insulted him. He gave it to Yale, where I presume it now is.

Councilman Peter A. Murray and the Traffic Lights

In the autumn of 1936, Harvard held its 300th anniversary celebration. All and sundry were invited, including the Boston City Councilmen.

Soon after these invitations had gone out we were having a hearing in the City Council on appropriations for traffic lights. Every Councilman wanted some in his district. I had applied for lights on Beacon Street, and they were included in the proposed appropriation. A number of Councilmen objected that I was getting more than my share. The day was won for me by Councilman Murray, an enormously fat man who was apparently asleep in the corner and looked like a sleeping hippopotamus. He suddenly opened his eyes and shouted, "We're all Harvard men today; let him have the lights." That settled it.

This reminds me of an incident relating to the obtaining for Harvard and other education institutions of a permit for an educational television station on top of Blue Hill, an area under the Division of

Parks of the Metropolitan District Commission. There had been many delays, and the applicants were getting nowhere. At this stage I was asked to help. I called on Commissioner Morrissey, whom I had known when he was head of the Boston Public Works Department. I told him of the educational purpose of the station and of the runaround which the applicants had been getting. To this he replied, "Oh, I did not know you were interested in it. I will attend to the matter," and he did. No graft was involved. It was just a matter of friendship. Mr. Morrissey died not long after that, and the Morrissey Boulevard was named after him.

Curley and the Horns

Shortly after his election for his second term as Mayor, I had luncheon at the Bellevue Hotel with James M. Curley. Also present were B. Loring Young, then Speaker of the House, and John W. McCormack, then a State Senator from South Boston and now Majority Leader of the House of Representatives in Washington.[1]

The Mayor was in a genial and expansive mood. One of the chief planks in his campaign was a 5¢ fare on the Boston Elevated, and he told us that what he had in mind was a zoned fare by which passengers would pay 5¢ for riding a certain distance and then another 5¢. Of course he did not tell this to the dear public. He also said that he would favor the taking over by the State, through the Metropolitan Park Service, of the City beaches and charging for use of the facilities, but that most mayors would not have the courage to do this. He never carried out this plan and never established zoned fares or restored the 5¢ fare.

At that time, under the City Charter, a mayor could not run to succeed himself. The purpose was to prevent a mayor from building up an organization through which he could perpetuate himself in office. In fact, however, this provision was right down Curley's alley. He probably never could have been elected for a consecutive term. He always left behind a legacy of obligations which required retrenchment, never a popular policy. His successor was burdened with these. After an enforced four-year interval, Curley had again thrown his hat into the ring and was elected. His past misdeeds had been forgotten, and he was to become Mayor for another four years. This failure of well-

[1] Subsequently elected Speaker of the House.

intentioned reform in City government was well illustrated by a story he told us.

During an active day campaigning at a series of rallies in Dorchester and the Roxburys, Curley was waiting on the sidewalk to take his car for the next rally when two women stepped up. They said, "Mr. Curley, will you kindly take off your hat?" To which he replied, "Ladies, I shall be delighted to do so, but why do you ask?" They replied, "We heard you had horns, and we wanted to know if it was true." To which, with his usual quickness and boldness, he replied, "Ladies, I did have horns during my last administration, but they have worn off in the interval."

No better illustration could be given of the failure of this well-intentioned "Reform" provision of the Charter. It was subsequently repealed.

Random Recollections of a Publisher

Alfred A. Knopf*

A little while ago Steve Riley leaned over to me and said, "Talk as long as you like." This reminded me of the last time I had the privilege of talking in Boston. While Walter Whitehill, who was the Clerk of the Club of Odd Volumes at the time, was going through the preliminaries, I was sitting on a sofa against the wall next to a very elderly member who leaned toward me and said, "Remember, young man, the longer the spoke, the greater the tire." That was the first intimation I had that evening of about how long I was expected to speak. So when I began I leaned over to Gus Loring and said, "Gus, you pull my coattail or tell me when to stop. My talk is like a string of sausages and I can stop at almost any point." I frequently turned to Gus and asked, "Should I stop?" and he'd say "No," but finally he said "Yes." He thought some of the older members wanted to catch their trains home.

I must apologize at this point. Everyone who has preceded me did his homework very carefully and seemed to have a nicely prepared manuscript from which he could read from beginning to end. I have a manuscript but I can't read it from the beginning to the end and you'll have to bear with me as I move around a bit in it. Usually speakers begin with a funny story, but I'm going to read you a letter I received many years ago from a very dear friend, Charles Beard, the historian. This was in 1922 and it concerned a small royalty check we had sent him. It gives you an idea, perhaps of me, but certainly of a side of Charles, which I think is too little known. Anyway, the letter read this way: "The check arrived. Three cheers! The history of that check is a delight. First, you write me saying it is enclosed. Steno forgets to enclose it. Second, bookkeeper sends it to Thomas Beer. Third, you send it with a note in your own hand. Steno forgets to put on postage and it is returned to you. Fourth, postage is duly put on envelope and it arrives in New Milford. Fifth, you write advising that said check has gone forth at last. You send your letter to Milford, instead of New Milford. Postmaster in Old Milford makes a guess that I'm up here and sends out a trial balloon. Here is proof. Cheer up, brother Knopf,

* This paper was read at the October, 1961, meeting.

you will be a literary character yet, instead of a business man. I am proud of you."

Now if my talk is at all worth listening to, it will not be on my own account but due to the people I am able to talk about. Every publishing house succeeds, I think—and I must apologize to Mr. Whitehill and to any others who may have heard some of this material years ago at the Club of Odd Volumes—every publisher that survives in this country seems usually to have a successful book very early in his publishing career. Ours was *Green Mansions* by W. H. Hudson. You know, all of you historians, I'm sure, how often it is extremely difficult to establish with documentation the truth of something you may feel quite sure is true. I always felt sure that Hudson had had a small Civil List pension and had given it up, but I never could find any reference to this in any book I consulted. I finally got from his estate a copy of a note written about Hudson by Viscount Grey of Fallodon. Grey had written, "For many of the best years of his life" (that is, Hudson's), "the lack even of the slender means that his simple wants required to travel and to lodge in a country village deprived him of opportunities to write books about the English country. He was tied to London or to its environs. His spirit was too fine and sensitive to complain or to seek help, but circumstances became known to friends and sympathy stirred. A Member of Parliament was urged to approach Mr. Balfour, then First Lord of the Treasury, and to suggest Hudson's name for a literary pension. Mr. Balfour received the appeal with ready sympathy, but there was some delay caused by the discovery that Hudson, having been born in the Argentine, was not a British citizen, although he had lived in England for some 25 years. The process of naturalization was completed and a pension of £150 a year was awarded in 1901. Never was so small a sum so well invested for English literature. The further history of it, though the details may seem trivial, illustrates the simplicity and delicacy of Hudson's nature. Mr. Balfour was told how well the little pension had been bestowed, and offered to increase it. Hudson was sounded by a friend and replied that he had now enough for his wants and did not desire more. Towards the end of his life, when his books were bringing in some income, he consulted a friend as to giving up the pension. It was certain that his means could not be very large and the advice given was that he should not resign the pension but he did resign it."

In 1934 Blanche Knopf, my wife, went to Zurich, where the Manns were then living, to try to persuade Tommy (I must explain that, curiously enough, everyone who knew Mann at all well, and sometimes after only a fairly brief acquaintance, called him Tommy; it didn't seem to fit, but so it was) to come to New York, where we wanted to celebrate his fifty-ninth birthday by a public dinner and the publication of *Tales of Jacob*, the first volume of what was to become the great Joseph Tetralogy. To our great delight, he and his wife, Katia, accepted at once. The birthday was June 6. The Mayor of New York at that time was La Guardia. La Guardia sent a motorcycle escort to take Mann from the ship to his hotel. Not uncharacteristically, the motorcyle men missed Mann entirely, and he came to the hotel without them. La Guardia also invited the Manns to sit in the reviewing stand at 23rd Street and Broadway to watch a parade. I was with them, and I must say I was very proud of the little Mayor when he came over and said, "Guten Tag, Herr Doktor, Ich habe nur gestern ihr *Tod in Venedic* gelesen." I don't think I need to translate that. Well, we gave him a dinner at the Plaza. I think Christian Gauss of Princeton acted as toastmaster. John Erskine spoke, and Mann read a little speech in English in which he committed a slight error which his wife never let him forget. She even reminded him of it in 1955 when he was celebrating his eightieth birthday. He said in the course of his speech that his publisher, Mr. Knopf, is also a "creature." Before he left New York, he wrote this very characteristic inscription in my copy of *Tales of Jacob*: "As the most felicitous result of this day, so rich in impressions and happy moments, I regard, dear Mr. Knopf, the human deepening and strengthening of the relationship between you, my American publisher, and myself, a relationship which I shall now beg you to call friendship and to which I want to give expression, when from the heart I dedicate to you this copy of your elegant edition of my most recent work as a remembrance of my first visit to New York, which you transformed into a unique celebration."

I pass over a good many years during which Mann lived first in Princeton, then in Pacific Palisades, California. After the war, he became very anxious to hear German spoken. He never returned to Germany, but he did go back to German-speaking Switzerland, and he found a comfortable villa in Kilchberg, just outside Zurich, where, if the wind was blowing from the right direction, you can bask in the de-

lightful scent that comes from the Lindt chocolate factory. In the spring of '55 as his eightieth birthday approached, I couldn't think of anything nicer to do for him (this is not so conceited as it sounds) than to fly to Zurich for the celebration. But I had no idea how German-speaking peoples manage these affairs. I discovered that while his birthday was on June 6, the celebrations began at noon on June 4 with a luncheon tendered by the city. That afternoon the Kilchberg community had *its* own special celebration, at which, among other people, the Swiss President spoke. There was also chamber music. After that there was a delightful dinner given by the town, also in Kilchberg. The next morning Dick Hottelot of CBS turned up with a television crew and worked most of the morning on Mann. Lunch was quiet, but that evening the City Theater was completely filled with an audience that came to hear readings from Mann's works by two leading actresses, three actors, and finally by Mann himself. Also, Bruno Walter had flown over from the States just to play one Mozart composition, and I don't know that I've ever heard such wild enthusiasm as greeted him. I thought that the Theater would come down with the stamping of feet. That was followed by a very elaborate supper party given by Mann's German publisher, Bermann-Fischer. The next day, the birthday itself, Mann received at home. The house was almost literally filled with flowers and presents, with three-feet high stacks of mail and telegrams. All kinds of people came, among them a young Norwegian from Oslo who had been in a third-class railroad carriage for I don't know how long, I think thirty-six hours. The celebrations finally concluded that evening with a reception at the Hotel Baur au Lac, followed by a birthday dinner there given by friends. Mann stood up under this remarkably. He didn't seem tired at all. But as you may recall, within a matter of two or three months he died, really of a calcified heart. The doctors felt that the birthday celebrations with the attendant excitement had actually stimulated him and helped keep him going rather than hurt him.

One of the most widely read and perhaps the most greatly loved book we ever published is Clarence Day's *Life with Father*. There's a generation growing up now that knows practically nothing about Day, which is a pity. Nobody has written about him. We are hoping that we can remedy that, but I'm not sure. I've reached the age when I'm amazed to realize how few people are left who knew people that I

think a lot of younger people ought to know more about. Day's work was first called to my attention by Max Eastman not long after the first World War when Day was writing book reviews for the old *Metropolitan* magazine, to which you may recall Theodore Roosevelt frequently contributed. We published *This Simian World* in 1920 and a year later a volume of essays, *The Crow's Nest*. Neither book attracted much attention, but I did get to know Day very well. He was almost completely bedridden. In those days he was able to get downstairs and into a touring car with the top down, in which we frequently would be driven around the Bronx for an hour or two. But as time went on he became much worse. He lived in a very old-fashioned apartment on Riverside Drive, where he turned day into night. He received most of his friends and had his breakfast around 9 in the evening. I used to be with him frequently until that time without even realizing that I had had no dinner. But I'm going to let Clarence talk for himself because he was really a superb letter-writer, and one of my great regrets is that none of his correspondence has been published. His widow still talks about preparing a collection. She has refused to let anyone else tamper with it, greatly to the grief of old A. G. Keller, the Yale sociologist, who had a long and special correspondence with Clarence which he always wanted to publish. Clarence seemed to lie fallow after the book of essays except for another failure, a collection of his drawings that he called *Thoughts without Words*. I think he rather anticipated Thurber. After the failure of that book he wrote me: "As to *Thoughts without Words*, you gave me a first rate get up, fine reproductions, and a great deal more advertising than you should have. You spent all the money on the book that even an author could ask. No publisher could have done more for me than you did and I don't believe I know any who would have done half as much. The horrible failure of that book to sell was all my fault, not yours" (you can begin to see why I am a somewhat spoiled publisher and hardly fit to operate at all in the year 1961). He continued: "I am finishing another thing now and this is a book too, or it would be if it were longer. It is shorter even than *This Simian World* and it has no pictures. You won't think much of it when I tell you it is merely a portrait of my father who was not an important figure in the world and that it is concerned almost entirely with his religious ideas and experiences. The title is 'God and My Father.' This doesn't sound promising, but on the other

hand, the editors of Harpers Magazine think it's the best thing I've done and Harpers Magazine will run it serially for me, I find, so it might pay its way if you felt like taking a chance on a book. You've lost so much on me, however, and times are so bad that if you would rather not publish it I shall fully sympathize with you. I really mean this, of course. C.D."

About that time we rather childishly devised—I have a suspicion that we stole it from Simon and Schuster; it was more their style than ours—a rather elaborate form which we asked an author to fill out for publicity purposes. We sent this to Day, and he wrote me: "Dear Alfred, Authors Form A is a forbidding looking document, worse than an income tax blank, and its pages are all fastened together in an inconvenient damn way, and it says 'kindly use ink' which I hate or a typewriter which I'm no good at, and worst of all it asks me to write in clear block letters. I tried to fill it in for you in clear block letters, similar to those used on tombstones, but I'm sorry to say I ruined it, Alfred. Here's a memo instead which you can have transcribed by a stonecutter if you like for your files."

Clarence suffered like almost everyone else as a result of the 1929 crash. He moved to a much less attractive apartment, and was not able to live so well as he had been living. In early 1935, he completed *Life with Father*, but, believe it or not, he did not make a clean typescript or keep a carbon copy, or indeed even a complete copy of this manuscript, which was put together largely with scissors and paste. We sent it off to the Plimpton Press and, as chance would have it, wrapped it together with an enormous manuscript by Bill Langer. Several days passed and Plimpton never mentioned the Day manuscript in their letters to us, although we were waiting for a sample page. At last we became concerned and 'phoned them. Answer: they had never received any such manuscript. Plimpton was certain it must have been thrown away with the outer wrappings of the enormous package of which it was a part. They sent three men into the Boston warehouse of the jobber to whom they sold their wastepaper. Every bale of waste there was opened and gone over without any luck. Then the three men were sent down to a paper mill in Connecticut which, in turn, bought the wastepaper from the Boston jobber. Three days were spent there vainly before the mill recalled that it had recently sent a small lot of wastepaper to the Crocker Burbank Company in Fitchburg. Three

more Plimpton men were sent to that mill, where they found that the waste in question was already being fed into the beaters. A watch was lined up along the chute, and at last a triumphant shout announced the appearance of a few pages of *Life with Father*. In the end, all but three pages of the manuscript were recovered. Here I must pay tribute to Mrs. Day, who kept her head throughout all this and refused to tell Clarence what had happened.

Well, the Book-of-the-Month Club took *Life with Father,* which would have assured it at least a reasonable success, but even so, Clarence wrote me, on the day of its publication, this inimitable letter: "Dear Alfred, Thanks for that good letter. Anyway this book will probably sell as well as or better than 'God and My Father' and they may help each other a little so at least I seem to be heading in the right direction. It all helps in the long run, and my next book ought to benefit by it. I hope you are keeping your head and not throwing your money out of the window by advertising before it takes hold. Studying your form chart, however, I haven't much confidence in you. You've gone mad and wasted good money on me in the past, and I suspect that sooner or later you will do it again. The *Saturday Review* phoned me a few days ago about having Robert Disraeli take some photographs of me here in my room. He took ten. Disraeli wanted me to put my clothes on for this occasion. It was too much of a job to get into my trousers but I did get into a shirt, nothing else. He said he'd leave out my bare legs."

Finally, when *Life with Father* was selling very well indeed and just a few weeks before his death, he wrote me: "You and your thousand a day." (I must have told him his book was selling a thousand copies a day.) "I don't quite dare say you're mad because you've seen ahead better than I have, so far, but I do say, Oh, my God! As for the royalties total, it is more than I thought and I don't know what to do about it." And at the end of this letter he drew a cartoon showing himself with an income tax form and a man stalking him and a note with an arrow pointing to the cartoon reading, "It's all Alfred's fault."

But you don't always have the happiest times with authors. Once the American Booksellers Association was meeting here in Boston, and Irvin Cobb was expected as the chief speaker. At the last minute Cobb sent word that he couldn't come. Alfred Harcourt spread the rumor—I never could decide whether innocently or maliciously—that Joseph Hergesheimer was a great after-dinner speaker. So I was persuaded to

send for Joe. He lived in West Chester, Pennsylvania, and in those days it was an hour's trip into Philadelphia. Then you took the train to Penn Station in New York. Then you crossed town to Grand Central. There you got your train to Boston. Well, by the time Joe got here he was pretty well fagged and badly in need of some liquid refreshment. At the dinner, unfortunately, he was seated not with Blanche and me but at the speaker's table between Amy Lowell and Roger Scaife of Houghton Mifflin. Scaife was extremely generous with champagne, and by the time Joe was called upon he was quite mellow. At the climax of his remarks, he raised his right hand this way, palm outward to the audience, and said: "Bookselling is the only profession"—and a titter of applause ran through the room—but he continued, "in which such colossal ignorance is displayed by those engaged in it." So Joe hurried away by an early morning train to New York, and I stayed behind to pick up the pieces among the booksellers. I estimated that his sales dropped about 50% in the next two or three months.

I think it was in 1919 that there happened to me the sort of thing a publisher dreams about but doesn't often experience. A lady named Willa Cather walked unannounced into our small offices on West 42nd Street. I remember we had only two rooms. Perhaps even more amazing, she expressed surprise to learn that I knew who she was, and you must remember she had already published *My Antonia,* so I didn't think I was very clever. She liked the kind of advertising we were doing (it must have been on a very small scale because we were very small publishers in those days), and I'd been given a good character, although he had never met me, by the husband of her closest friend. This was Jan Hambourg, the violinist, who had married Isabel McClung, who, curiously enough, was the daughter of the judge before whom Alexander Berkman appeared after he tried so ineptly to assassinate Henry Frick. (There ought to be a school for would-be assassins. See what a botch that South African farmer made of his attempt. The closer you get to your victim, the wider of the mark your aim seems to go.) Thus we came to publish *Youth and the Bright Medusa.* One day later on, I told her I had done something rather unusual in accepting a book of short stories without asking for any commitment for the future. She immediately replied that while she felt Houghton Mifflin had to have her next novel, I would certainly have the one after that. But actually she stayed with us. When one evening she came to

a party at our apartment she took me into the bedroom and showed me a letter she had just received from Ferris Greenslet acknowledging one from her in which she told him she was coming over to us. Willa Cather was a lady of a very special kind—a kind I think is now all but extinct. It is significant that while we knew her very well for more than a quarter of a century we never called her anything but Miss Cather. Compare that with *Tommy* Mann. And her literary executor, with whom she lived for many, many years, when she speaks of her friend to me today, always refers to her as Miss Cather. Loyalty was one of her great qualities. If she was on your side, you simply couldn't do anything wrong, but if she wasn't on your side, you simply couldn't do anything right. She left, as you may know, a most unusual will. But I know it expressed what she strongly believed. It forbids motion pictures or dramatizations to be made of her books, and more curiously forbids the publication of any of her letters. She did allow *A Lost Lady* to be made into a picture not long after it was published, and her experience convinced her that, as she always said, if she had wanted to write motion pictures, she would have written motion pictures. If she had wanted to write plays, she would have written plays. But since she only wanted to write novels, novels they'd have to remain. She liked good food and good drink, and our presents to her were usually wines.

The best selling book we ever published (you may have all heard of it though I doubt if many of you have read it) is *The Prophet*, a book of prose poems by Kahlil Gibran. Shortly after the end of the first World War, I was invited to a lunch in Greenwich Village by three young men of letters for the purpose of having me meet Gibran, and to be persuaded to publish him. In 1920 we brought out a slim volume of prose poems called *The Madman*. It had a very small sale. Next we took a chance on a very expensive book of his drawings which had no sale at all. Then in 1923 came *The Prophet*. The sales are so symmetrical that they sound phony, but they are accurate as I give them to you. It sold 1,300 copies the first year, over 2,500 the next, over 5,000 the third year, and since then it has never sold fewer than 10,000 copies in any one year and has gotten as high as 70,000. A while ago its sale passed 1,000,000 copies. We have never really advertised it. We started a small campaign once many years ago, but as the sales seemed to fall off we soon stopped.

Consider Mr. Salinger, whose latest book is doing extremely well, while his publishers, I understand, by his instructions are virtually forbidden to advertise it, certainly not permitted to say anything about it in their advertising copy. If people want a book they are just bound to have it.

It is a curious thing with some authors. They become shrewd judges of which of their books are to become most popular. The only time Willa Cather ever asked me to increase her royalty a little bit was on *Death Comes for the Archbishop*, which, she was convinced, and rightly so, would have a long and continuing sale. But I don't want you to get the idea that she was greedy. The increase she asked for was one per cent, and she refused to take it on any later book. Gibran too was like that. When *The Prophet* began to sell at the rate of 10,000 or more a year, he would shrug his shoulders and say, "What did I tell you? I always said it would." He lived in a very old-fashioned, physically unattractive, but almost historic studio in Greenwich Village down on West 10th Street and almost died there. He had cancer and was lying like a dog on some old rugs when a Lebanese friend, a woman who had a jewelry shop on Park Avenue, Madame El Khoury, got him into a hospital just a couple of days before he died. He left most of his royalties to his native town in Lebanon. They formed a committee there, the National Committee of Gibran, and, in time, there sprang up a competing committee. It is like the two Dmitris in Boris Godounoff, a true one and a false one, and much of the time we have to hold substantial sums in escrow waiting for the instructions of the court.

As I think you'd gather from even the experiences I've related, our business was a very personal affair for a very long, long time. We really had no editors in the modern sense of the word, and I think as a result of this as publishers we became more than a little spoiled. Perhaps a good deal of my spoiling came through the influence that Henry Mencken exerted on me, and I would like to give you briefly an idea of the kind of man I think he really was. There have been books about him, but they don't picture the Mencken I knew, and here again I come to the problem I referred to earlier. I know that there are not more than two people alive today who could possibly write adequately about Mencken (I'm not one of them), and I don't think either of them will.

He was, of course, first and last a newspaper man. His public side

was visible to everyone, cynical, amusing, and exasperating by turns, but always consistent. Henry really never changed his mind about anything. On the other hand, the private man was something quite different, a sentimental South German type, generous and unwavering in his devotion to people he liked. Indeed, I never knew anyone who had met him to dislike him. The nasty things you heard about him were always from people who had never seen him in the flesh. He was certainly one of the greatest newspapermen of his generation. He was a superb philologist, as the three large volumes dealing with the American language testify. He knew more about medicine and the law and religion than any layman who ever passed my way. He was passionately fond of music but cared chiefly for the nineteenth-century German romantic composers. He once said, "I am ombibulous. I like alcohol in every known form." But in all our long years together I never saw him under its influence. During Prohibition he prided himself on the ability he insisted he possessed to locate beer within ten minutes of his arrival in any town. I found this to be almost literally true. We used to go together to the Bach Festival at Bethlehem. Once we had to wait twenty-four hours before a taxicab driver turned around to us and said, "Do you really want some beer?" and took us where we could get it.

Henry was, one might say, a ferocious correspondent, for whenever he was home he answered every letter he received within twenty-four hours, and estimates of the number of letters from him that now exist run from 15,000 to 50,000. We managed to publish a selection of them but only through the good offices of a young French student of Mencken's work. No American friend of mine did more than take a look at what was involved before he shied away from it. Julian Boyd for years collected photostats and microfilms of Mencken's letters in the hope that he would be able to edit them. But you know what happened to Julian. Jefferson got *him*! Even today Mencken's books are standing up awfully well. We've sold during the past three years over 100,000 copies of Alistair Cooke's paperback, *The Vintage Mencken*. He was at his best in conversation, of which only a very little has been recorded. There is, however, one record made of a long interview just a few months before his first stroke, and published by the Library of Congress. In that he said, "Never drink when you have work to do. Never drink while the sun is shining. Never drink alone; that

way you become a drunkard." He also in this interview gave what I think is as good a definition of free speech as I've ever heard. He was a great libertarian, as you know. But this was not so much a definition of free speech as of its tolerable limits. He said, if a Catholic friend asks him what he thinks of the Mass the friend has just heard, he has a perfect right to tell him, but he has no right to stand on the steps of the cathedral and, as the people come out from the Mass, denounce it. You have no right to make a nuisance of yourself to your neighbors, but, short of that, you should be allowed to say anything you like.

I quote from three letters. When I first knew him, he had published a couple of books with a little Boston firm, John W. Luce and Company, which was owned by a friend of his named Schaff. He didn't expect Schaff to make regular payments to him of royalties. They were too good friends for anything like that. But one day he got a check from Schaff. He wrote me, "The sight of Schaff's check paralyzed my tongue. It was as if a beautiful widow took me aside to show me her appendicitis scar." Some years later he was in Berlin, where my wife and I had been not long before. He ended a letter, "Tell Blanche that the Sohlers" (German friends of his) "always refer to her as *die schöne Frau Knopf*. On the question of your own beauty they are polite but not enthusiastic. I told them that you and Harding were regarded as the handsomest living Americans." When our only child began to go to school, he sent me what he headed "Memorandum for Pat." It read in part as follows: "1. To the day of his death, George Washington believed that $8 \times 6 = 54$. 2. Christopher Columbus was such a poor mathematician that he miscalculated the distance to America by 1,500 miles. 3. During all his years at school, President Harding answered but one question in arithmetic correctly and that was—how much was twice one? 4. On coming to long division in school, Abraham Lincoln gave up his education in disgust and became a lawyer. 5. Charlie Chaplin has made $4,000,000, yet he can't tell one decimal from another. 6. Girls are not taught arithmetic in school, yet when they grow up they marry rich men and always have plenty of money."

I think on that note, if I may, I will release you.

Memoir

Lawrence Waters Jenkins

Ernest S. Dodge

Lawrence Waters Jenkins, who was elected a Resident Member of the Massachusetts Historical Society on December 13, 1934, died on April 20, 1961, at the age of eighty-eight. He was born in Salem on December 23, 1872, the son of Charles T. and Lucy Weston Jenkins. He prepared for college at Noble's School and received his A.B. from Harvard in 1896. At college he went out for track and was a pole vaulter on the Harvard team in the days before bamboo poles made modern records possible.

Following his graduation from college, Jenkins took a position as Assistant Superintendent of the Crows Nest Mining Company in Melrose, Nova Scotia, where he remained from 1897 to 1899. In 1900 he made an extended trip on horseback through some of the wilder parts of Mexico and acquired a lasting interest in the old West. This Mexican trip had a great influence on his life, for he visited several Indian tribes, collected examples of their material culture, and probably acquired an interest in ethnology that prompted him to join the staff of the Peabody Museum of Salem (then called the Peabody Academy of Science) as a volunteer immediately on his return that same year.

The year 1901 fixed the pattern of his life, for he became a regular member of the Museum staff, and he was married in Salem to Arvilla Bray. Three children were born to them: Stephen Waters in 1902, Dorothy in 1906, and Benjamin Gilbert in 1907. Shortly after their marriage the Jenkinses purchased the home on Locust Street in Danvers where they lived thereafter.

While Colonel Jenkins, as he was known to most of his friends (although a few old and intimate ones always called him "Tommy"), began his professional life as a mining engineer, his interest in history manifested itself at an early age, for he became a member of the Essex Institute in 1895. Although he lived in Danvers most of his life, he always considered himself a Salemite, and it was the history of his native city which he knew in the most intimate detail. Throughout his life his twin interests of ethnology and history ran parallel. As a mu-

seum man he was one of the last of the old school, serving under Edward S. Morse, then Director, and John Robinson, who devoted much of his life as a trustee, treasurer, and a curator of the Peabody Museum. Morse was a zoologist and ethnologist, Robinson a botanist and a historian who developed the maritime resources of the institution at a time when material was abundantly available. Lawrence Jenkins was greatly influenced by both men.

As a man in the old museum tradition, Colonel Jenkins was a great collector—he was born with what the late Thomas Barbour described as the "pack rat instinct," and it served him well. He was instrumental, especially with the financial help of his friends, Dr. Charles G. Weld and Stephen W. Phillips, in obtaining many large and important ethnological collections for the Peabody Museum. He was also adept in finding and steering in the right direction log books, journals, broadsides, and manuscript material, thereby greatly enriching the holdings of both the Museum and the Essex Institute. His friendship with men of similar interests like Charles H. Taylor, Charles Wright, Robert G. Clark, and George C. Stone, resulted in other collections' coming to the Museum. His knowledge of Salem history, arms and armor, ethnological material, and maritime paintings was encyclopedic.

While his knowledge was vast and his friendship warm, he was not fond of public appearances. He disliked lecturing and writing, and yet on the rare occasions when he did either it was done with competence and sincerity. Some twenty-five historical and ethnological articles and catalogues came from his pen, and he edited the journal of William Endicott, published by the Marine Research Society in 1923, under the title *Wrecked Among Cannibals in the Fijis*. He was moderately interested in publishing and a founder of both the Essex Book and Print Club and the Marine Research Society.

Another aspect of Lawrence Jenkins' life was a military career which began in 1892 as a private in the First Corps Cadets. Thereafter he was continuously in a military organization (Second Corps Cadets, Massachusetts National Guard, Massachusetts State Guard) until retiring as a Lieutenant Colonel from the Massachusetts National Guard in 1920.

Colonel Jenkins' many memberships reflected his diverse interests and activities. He was a charter member of the American Association of Museums, a Fellow of the American Anthropological Association

and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He was elected to membership in the American Antiquarian Society in 1915, and a Resident Member of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts in 1943. In all he belonged to thirty-two historical organizations and learned societies including the New England Historic Genealogical Society, Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities, Society for Nautical Research, and the Armor and Arms Club of New York. He was a past Clerk and Master of the Salem Marine Society, a past President of the now defunct Salem Club, a Trustee of the Ropes Memorial, a member of the Council of the Essex Institute from 1905 to 1951, and Honorary Curator of Manuscripts at that institution for forty years from 1921 to 1961.

Throughout his active career, however, it was the Peabody Museum of Salem that was his home and his chief interest. Beginning as a volunteer in 1900, he became Honorary Curator of Ethnology in 1901, Curator of Ethnology from 1901 to 1949, Assistant Director in Charge from 1914 to 1937, Curator of Marine Rooms from 1925 to 1949, Director from 1937 to 1950, and Director Emeritus from 1950 until his death.

Those who knew or worked with Colonel Jenkins (as I did for thirty years) will always remember him for his kindness and humanity. He was infinitely patient in helping neophytes and in running down obscure historical details of any problem he received an inquiry about. We remember him too for his quick step easily recognized, and as a congenial companion on a trip, at dinner, or with a group of friends.

Meetings

January Meeting, 1961

The Society met in the Dowse Library at three o'clock in the afternoon of Thursday, January 12, 1961, President Adams in the chair.

The record of the stated meeting of December 8 was read and approved.

The Corresponding Secretary reported the receipt of letters of acceptance of election to Resident Membership from Douglas Wallace Bryant, of Lexington, and Kenneth Schuyler Lynn, of Cambridge, and of election to Corresponding Membership from David Herbert Donald, of Princeton, New Jersey, and Nicholas Biddle Wainwright, of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The Treasurer reported that the Endowment Fund stood at $107,421, the Library Fund at $5,501, and that the Building Fund had met its goal. It was voted to express the thanks of the Society to the President for his initiative in raising this money for the improvement of the building.

Sir Frank Chalton Francis, K.C.B., of London, England, was elected a Corresponding Member, Mr. Gilmore acting as his Sponsor, and Milton Halsey Thomas, of Princeton, New Jersey, was elected a Corresponding Member, Mr. Riley acting as his Sponsor.

The Director reported the following accessions:

From Vincent L. Eaton, of Silver Spring, Maryland, a manuscript copy of the speeches delivered May 31, 1859, at the banquet at the Revere House, Boston, given under the auspices of the Boston Chess Club to Mr. Paul Morphy on his return from his triumphs in Europe.

From Mrs. Reginald Foster, of Needham, Dr. C. Grant LaFarge, of Brookline, and Mr. W. E. R. LaFarge, of New York, New York, partly by gift and partly by deposit, the papers of Senator George Frisbie Hoar (1826–1904) and his son Rockwood Hoar, other Hoar and Webster material, and twenty-one Adams autographs including an exchange of letters between John Adams and Col. Josiah Quincy in October, 1775, about defending Boston Harbor; several important letters from Adams to Elbridge Gerry between 1777 and 1797; two answers by President Adams to addresses on the war crisis with France in 1798; seven letters to James Madison, 1812–1818, on a variety of topics; and one to C. W. F. Dumas, the American agent at The Hague during and after the Revolution.

From Dr. George Cheever Shattuck, the travel diary of Dr. George Cheyne Shattuck (1813–1893) for the period December 1, 1834–April 6, 1836. There are later entries in the handwriting of Dr. and Mrs. Shattuck from July 2, 1840–March 29, 1841.

By purchase: 33 notebook-diaries kept by Aaron White (1793–1886), a member of the Harvard Class of 1817. The diaries are for the years 1815–1880, with a few gaps, and show the many-sided interests of Mr. White, who was in turn a teacher, lawyer, and storekeeper; an important letterbook and account book of James Bowdoin (1752–1811), mainly in a clerk's hand, for the period November 13, 1804–March 18, 1806, while he was serving as United States Minister to Spain; 46 pieces relating to the Prescott family of Groton, November 26, 1799–May 26, 1830; 7 letters written by James Savage to his mother, Mrs. Mary Lincoln, October 26, 1803–June 1, 1806; and 20 pieces relating to the Peabody family, October 10, 1841–March 30, 1909.

Dr. Viets remarked that the Shattuck diary filled a gap in the life of Dr. George Cheyne Shattuck; that the Boston Medical Library had diaries of other years, but that he had little information on the period covered by this manuscript when he wrote the life of Dr. Shattuck for the *Dictionary of American Biography*.

In introducing Mr. Bernard Bailyn, who read a paper on "Political Experience and Enlightenment Ideas in Eighteenth-Century America,"[1] the President expressed the Society's pleasure that on the previous Monday the Overseers had confirmed Mr. Bailyn's promotion to Professor of History at Harvard University.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

February Meeting, 1961

THE Society met in the Dowse Library at three o'clock in the afternoon of Thursday, February 9, 1961, President Adams in the chair.

The record of the stated meeting of January 12 was read and approved.

The Corresponding Secretary reported the receipt of letters from Sir Frank Chalton Francis, K.C.B., of London, England, and Milton Halsey Thomas, of Princeton, New Jersey, accepting election to Corresponding Membership.

[1] Printed in the *American Historical Review*, LXVII (1962), 339–351.

The Treasurer reported that the Library Fund now stood at $5,817 and the Building Fund at $50,915.

The President reported the death of Gilbert Holland Montague,[2] elected a Corresponding Member on March 14, 1946, that had occurred on February 4, 1961.

Franklin Lewis Ford, of Belmont, was elected a Resident Member, Mr. Buck acting as his Sponsor. Stephen Phillips, of Salem, was elected a Resident Member, the President (in the absence of Mr. Wheatland) acting as his Sponsor.

Marcus Falkner Cunliffe, of Manchester, England, was elected a Corresponding Member, Mr. Freiberg acting as his Sponsor. Barnaby Conrad Keeney, of Providence, Rhode Island, was elected a Corresponding Member, Mr. Whitehill acting as his Sponsor.

The Director reported the following accessions:

From the American Antiquarian Society, the diary of Cotton Tufts for the year 1769.

From Mrs. Amos Wilder, of Cambridge, a small but important collection of letters addressed chiefly to Gen. Artemas Ward, 1761–1791.

From Thomas James Wilson, a number of volumes recently published on American history and biography.

By purchase: a small collection of manuscripts of the Tudor family, 1773–1827. The collection—52 pieces in all— consists largely of the correspondence of William Tudor and Miss Delia Jarvis, later Mrs. William Tudor; 9 letters exchanged chiefly between Charles Francis Adams (1835–1915) and Nathan Matthews about the islands of Boston Harbor, 1902–1909; and the following 4 significant letters: Wait Still Winthrop to G. Denison, May 16, 1712; Theodore Sedgwick to Benjamin Lincoln, August 20, 1791; Gov. John A. Andrew to the Mayor of Boston, August 6, 1862; and Wendell Phillips to Mr. Drake, February 22, 1875.

Mr. B. Loring Young then read a paper entitled "Martin Lomasney as I Knew Him," which was followed by comments by Mr. Henry L. Shattuck and others.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

[2] For an obituary, see the *New York Times*, Feb. 6, 1961, p. 23.

March Meeting, 1961

THE Society met in the Dowse Library at three o'clock in the afternoon of Thursday, March 9, 1961, Vice-President Seaver in the chair.

The record of the stated meeting of February 9, read by the Cabinet-Keeper in the absence of the Recording Secretary, was approved.

The Corresponding Secretary reported the receipt of acceptances of election to Resident Membership from Franklin Lewis Ford, of Belmont, and Stephen Phillips, of Salem, and of election to Corresponding Membership from Marcus Falkner Cunliffe, of Manchester, England, and Barnaby Conrad Keeney, of Providence, Rhode Island.

The Treasurer reported that the Endowment Fund stood at $107,421, the Library Fund at $7,291, and the Building Fund at $51,000.

Philip Hofer, of Cambridge, sponsored by William A. Jackson, and Henry Donaldson Jordan, of Worcester, sponsored by Mr. Riley, were then elected to Resident Membership, and Jacques Barzun, of New York, New York, sponsored by Mr. Moody, and Sir Isaiah Berlin, of Oxford, England, sponsored by Mr. Hammond, were elected to Corresponding Membership.

The Director reported the following accessions:

From Walter D. Briggs, of Berkeley, California, the Civil War letters of Dr. Charles E. Briggs, surgeon in the Massachusetts 54th Volunteer Infantry.

From Baron Rudolph von Keudell, of Hessen, Germany, the Revolutionary War journal of Wilhelm Freÿenhagen, lieutenant in the Hessian Regiment von Donop, 1776–1779.

From Dr. Herbert E. Klingelhofer, of Bethesda, Maryland, a manuscript containing the suggested text for the memorial plaques to John and Abigail Adams in the Stone Church in Quincy. The manuscript bears alterations in the hand of John Quincy Adams.

From Dr. George C. Shattuck, six pieces of paper currency not previously in the Society's collection.

From Mrs. Bertha Shaw Whitney, of Newton Centre, a sampler done by Abigail Belknap (d. 1811) in 1736 while in her tenth year.

By purchase: a copy of Jonathan Edwards, *A Faithful Narrative of the Surprizing Work of God. . . . The Second Edition* (London, 1738).

Mr. Riley then showed the Burgis-Price view of Boston and ex-

pressed his hope that funds for its repair, authorized by the Council, would be forthcoming.

Mr. George T. Goodspeed then read a paper entitled "*Father Abbey's Will.*"[3]

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 P.M.

April Meeting, 1961

THE Society met in the Dowse Library on Thursday, April 13, 1961, at three o'clock in the afternoon, President Adams in the chair.

The record of the stated meeting of March 9, read by the Cabinet-Keeper in the absence of the Recording Secretary, was approved.

The Corresponding Secretary reported the receipt of acceptances of election to Resident Membership from Philip Hofer, of Cambridge, and Henry Donaldson Jordan, of Worcester, and of election to Corresponding Membership from Jacques Barzun, of New York, New York, and Sir Isaiah Berlin, of Oxford, England.

The Treasurer reported that the Endowment Fund had reached $107,451, the Library Fund $12,124, and the Building Fund $51,035.

The President reported on alterations to the Society's building; called attention to the edition of Saltonstall papers being prepared by Mr. Moody; noted the threatened transfer of Moswetuset Hummock (site of the Indian tribe that gave its name to Massachusetts) in Quincy Bay from state to private control, urging Members to use their influence to prevent the transfer; and mentioned the transfer to the Society of the accrued funds of the Adams Memorial Society.

C. Rodgers Burgin, of Milton, sponsored by Mr. Hamilton, was then elected to Resident Membership, and John Melville Jennings, of Richmond, Virginia, sponsored by Mr. Butterfield, was elected to Corresponding Membership.

The Director reported the following accessions:

From Goodspeed's Book Shop, a volume containing the records of the Deputy Paymaster of the Continental Congress at Boston, June 24, 1776–March 31, 1778.

[3] Printed in this volume, pp. 18–37.

From Alfred A. Knopf, 44 volumes of recent publications on American history and biography.

From Mrs. Harrison F. Lyman, of Winchester, several plans of East Boston issued in 1851 and 1879, and an engraving of the residence of Guy C. Haynes, the first house erected in East Boston, August, 1833.

From Max Slater, of Brookline, 5 handsome leather-bound volumes of the *Gazette de France*, 1778–1782.

From Dr. Henry R. Viets, a number of current publications including pictorial histories of American art and of World War II.

By purchase: the bookplate of David Greene (1749–1812), by Paul Revere.

Mr. Mason Hammond read a paper entitled "Ancient Rome and Modern America Reconsidered."[4]

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 P.M.

May Meeting, 1961

THE Society met in the Dowse Library on Thursday, May 11, 1961, at three o'clock in the afternoon, President Adams in the chair.

The record of the stated meeting of April 13 was read and approved.

The Corresponding Secretary reported the receipt of acceptances of election to Resident Membership from C. Rodgers Burgin, of Milton, and of election to Corresponding Membership from John Melville Jennings, of Richmond, Virginia.

The Treasurer reported that the Endowment Fund stood unchanged, that the Library Fund had risen to $14,776, and that the Building Fund had reached $52,890. Mr. Paine also asked that the following motion be approved: "That the income of the Massachusetts Historical Trust Fund for the last financial year be retained in the Treasury to be expended for such objects as may seem desirable to the Council of the Society." It was so voted.

President Adams noted the death on April 20, 1961, in Peabody, of Lawrence Waters Jenkins,[5] elected a Resident Member on December 13, 1934.

Reporting on alterations to the Society's building, the President

[4] Printed in this volume, pp. 3–17.

[5] For a memoir, see this volume, pp. 107–109.

noted that the Council had authorized work to proceed on the Adams Room, confident that full funds to complete the work would be forthcoming. Mr. Adams also appealed to the membership for gifts of furniture, rugs, silver, and china for the Oliver Room and the round room adjoining it.

The Society elected John Daniel Cushing, of Hingham, sponsored by Mr. Riley, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, of Boston, sponsored by the President, and William Lincoln Payson, of Cambridge, sponsored by Mr. Ames, to Resident Membership, and Comer Vann Woodward, of Baltimore, Maryland, sponsored by Mr. Handlin, to Corresponding Membership.

The President announced the appointment of the following Nominating Committee: Thomas James Wilson, *Chairman*; L. H. Butterfield, Edward Pierce Hamilton, and John Bryant Paine, Jr., to prepare a ballot for the Annual Meeting in October.

The Director reported the following accessions:

From Sherman Adams, of Lincoln, New Hampshire, a letter written by Samuel Adams to Joseph E. Worcester, Boston, February 21, 1820.

From Thomas Boylston Adams, a number of books formerly belonging to Henry Adams (1838–1918) to be added to the Henry Adams Library.

From the American Antiquarian Society, a copy of the very rare pamphlet, [Cotton Mather], *The Converted Sinner* (Boston, 1724).

By purchase: a small collection of manuscripts of Joseph Bradley Varnum (1751–1821) and family, 1811–1843. Varnum was a senator from Massachusetts and a speaker of the national House of Representatives.

Samuel Eliot Morison then read a paper entitled "The Peace Convention of February, 1861."[6]

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 P.M.

September Meeting, 1961

The publication of four volumes of the *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams* by The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press on September 22, 1961, was commemorated by a ceremony held at the Massachusetts Historical Society at three o'clock in the afternoon of that day. The speakers on this occasion were Lyman Henry Butterfield, Editor in Chief of *The Adams Papers*, Thomas

[6] Printed in this volume, pp. 58–80.

James Wilson, Director of the Harvard University Press, Paul Herman Buck, Carl H. Pforzheimer University Professor, Harvard University, Julian Parks Boyd, Editor of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson,* and Samuel Flagg Bemis, biographer of John Quincy Adams and President of the American Historical Association.

Prior to the ceremony, President Thomas Boylston Adams of the Massachusetts Historical Society gave a luncheon at the Tavern Club for the speakers, the Editors, and members of the Administrative and Editorial Advisory Boards of *The Adams Papers.* Among the guests were John Adams, Whitfield Jenks Bell, Jr., Associate Librarian of the American Philosophical Society, Wayne C. Grover, Archivist of the United States, Philip May Hamer, Executive Director of the National Historical Publications Commission, Alfred A. Knopf, Leonard Woods Labaree, Editor of *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin,* President Nathan Marsh Pusey of Harvard University, Edward K. Thompson, Editor of *Life,* and J. Russell Wiggins, Editor of *The Washington Post.*

Although the ceremony was held in Ellis Hall, many of the 400 Members and guests had to content themselves with seats in the Dowse Library and other parts of the building, to which the addresses were relayed by a public address system. With their programs those present received a keepsake in the form of a facsimile of a letter from John Adams to Abigail Adams, dated at Falmouth, July 9, 1774, from the original in the Adams manuscripts in the Society. Reproduced in collotype by The Meriden Gravure Company, the keepsakes were bound in covers printed by The Stinehour Press.

In calling the meeting to order, President Adams *gave the following address:*

Ladies and gentlemen:

It is a pleasure to welcome you here today to celebrate the occasion of the publication of the first four volumes of *The Adams Papers.* We are honored that so many of you have chosen to come. This distinguished gathering would have surprised the people who wrote the papers whose publication we now celebrate. The Adamses were not accustomed to popularity in their lifetimes. I am glad they have achieved it now they are dead.

The honor you accord them by coming here today is the more remarkable because of the unusual weather conditions. Many of you made your way hither yesterday through what we now call a hurricane, what we used to call an equinoctial storm. I think that all of us in reading Mr. Butterfield's volumes, the publication of which we celebrate today, will come on apt quotations which will presently please us. I happened on one of John Adams which fits the present occasion perfectly. It is the sole entry for one day. It consists of just one sentence. "Read little, thought little, for the Northeaster undid me."

We are gathered to honor the first publication of what may be the greatest single task of a Society already famous for its publications. Six generations ago, in 1792, the Massachusetts Historical Society (founded the year before) produced its first volume. Hundreds have followed, including all its *Proceedings*, the *Harvard Graduates* series, the *Winthrop Papers*, the definitive *History of Plymouth Plantation*, *The Education of Henry Adams*.

The preservation and publication of original documents is the essential material of history. Out of this the historian and the philosopher shape the ideas and principles which, to a very large extent, govern contemporary behavior.

Most human reflexes are conditioned by memory. History is the collective memory of mankind. That this memory is defective is attested by mankind's recurrent failure to heed the fire no matter how badly it is burnt.

Just how much of this defect of memory can be traced to defective sources, I do not know. I surmise that the misinterpretation of history is more easily accomplished if the sources are not readily available. The fool and the rascal have it all their own way in politics when the people are ignorant.

The acceleration of the rate of discovery of how to control the material universe has made contemporary man a geologic force and threatens to make him an involuntary cosmic one. And yet his knowledge of how to govern himself is not conspicuously improved since the eighteenth century. Only very recently have scientists recognized that they had any duty other than to discover and invent. Contemporary society is slow to realize what was patent to the twelfth century, that not even God can stand between mankind and its own acts.

We here have responsibility. History is a powerful force. Historians need to recognize their power. They are apt to be diffident, because if they are true historians they are humble in their ignorance, knowing that absolute truth is not attainable. But a working knowledge of the lessons of history is a necessity for survival. We have to know how we got here. If we step back into any of the old bogs we are done for.

That these lessons shall be honest lessons is the duty of this Society. It is a duty which all of us here present share. The Members and friends of this Society and their predecessors have made its work possible by contributing time and treasure these 170 years and with no expectation of reward except that the truth shall be known as far as the truth can be known.

The Trustees of the manuscripts now given to the world through the generosity of *Life* magazine and the wisdom of Harvard University and the devoted effort of Mr. Butterfield and his staff and Mr. Riley and the staff of this Society laid down but one condition on their gift of the Papers. That condition was that the microfilm of the whole should be available to all comers and that if a document was selected for printing it should be printed, whole and entire, no single word expunged.

How well Mr. Butterfield has accomplished his task is for you to judge. These four volumes we celebrate today are his first testament.

President Adams then invited Mr. Butterfield *to speak for himself:*

President Adams, ladies and gentlemen:

I would like, if I may, to take a bow of one minute, in order to draw your attention to the acorn-and-oakleaf device and its motto printed on the front of your programs and on the dedication page of the volumes now published.

The device was redrawn for us by our distinguished friend and fellow Member, Mr. Rudolph Ruzicka. Mr. Burton Stratton of the Harvard University Press happily decided to use it as a decorative motif for the Adams edition as a whole.

John Quincy Adams liked to plant trees. His grandsons Charles and Henry remembered the peach stones in jars at the Old House in Quincy which they disarranged when they visited the old gentleman in his study. In 1833, when President Andrew Jackson was touring

New England and was to receive an honorary degree from Harvard, Josiah Quincy, then president of Harvard, came out to the Old House to urge Adams to attend the ceremony as a member of the Board of Overseers. Adams declined. He would stay home and tend his nursery, he said, rather than witness the "disgrace" of his Alma Mater in "conferring her highest literary honors upon a barbarian who could not write a sentence of grammar."

It was a little before this that the ex-President had had his acorn-and-oakleaf seal cut to wear with his watch and to use in sealing letters. The motto was from the Latin writer Caecilius Statius as quoted by Cicero in the First Tusculan Disputation: *Serit arbores quæ alteri seculo prosint*. He plants trees for the benefit of another century—or, more freely, for future generations.

"I have had my share," he reflected in his Diary at this time, "in planting laws and institutions according to the measure of my ability and opportunities. I would willingly have had more." But he would have to be satisfied, he realized, with the gratitude of a few thoughtful people who sensed, as he did, that his aspirations for his country were "beyond the temper of the age."

Nothing better symbolizes the aims of this Society, at once venerable and vigorous, of The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press under Mr. Wilson's direction, and of the Adams family, than John Quincy Adams' motto, ALTERI SECULO, in conjunction with the planting of trees. The trees the Adamses planted have borne fruit which is now nourishing historical scholarship, and will continue to do so in still later centuries, in many parts of the world.

My colleagues and I feel that it is an inestimable privilege to have had a part in gathering and disseminating this rich harvest.

At the conclusion of Mr. Butterfield's remarks, President Adams asked the Director of the Society, Mr. Riley, to rise. He did not do so because he was in some distant part of the building answering a telephone. When, after a second summons, Mr. Riley failed to appear, President Adams remarked:

I am sorry that Mr. Riley cannot be found. I suppose he is down in the cellar holding up some corner of the building. Mr. Riley is a pillar of historical research. He is the most modest and uncomplaining of men.

He responds to cries of help from historians. Since I am not an historian, he refuses to appear for me. But if an historian need help, Mr. Riley gives it and never asks or expects thanks. He and his loyal staff have been the quiet workers without whose help this project could not have been accomplished. I take this opportunity to thank Mr. Riley for what he has done and will continue to do, quietly, effectively, and selflessly, for historians throughout the nation and throughout the world.

In introducing Mr. Wilson, *President Adams said:*

No man has done more to make possible this publication than Mr. Wilson. Had he not interested the authorities of Harvard in committing the resources of The Belknap Press to the publication, there could have been no beginning. But having accomplished this first major and most important step, Mr. Wilson was not content. Not long after, through his friend (and then Chairman of his Visiting Committee) Mr. Roy Larsen, he succeeded in interesting the publishers of *Life* magazine in providing funds for the immense task of editorial work necessary to prepare the papers for the press. Without the effort and interest of Mr. Wilson in initiating and pursuing this great object, we would not be gathered here today to celebrate its first results.

Mr. Wilson *then spoke as follows:*

Ladies and gentlemen:

I have been a publisher for thirty-one years. If I am remembered, I should like to be remembered as the man who realized that *The Adams Papers* must have a uniform, dignified letterpress edition—that they must not be dispersed, volume by volume, among many publishers, with consequent changes of emphasis and format, and necessary loss of public impact and historical influence. I am proud to say that my colleagues in the Press and the governing boards to which I am responsible shared my feeling. Today is the great day of my publishing career.

President Adams then introduced Mr. Buck *as follows:*

Without the help, interest, and co-operation of Harvard University, this project would not have been possible. Mr. Buck, because of his long association with the Harvard Press and with the management of the University, was a prime mover in committing the Press and the University to the project. We are deeply grateful to Mr. Buck for his help. Because there is a Harvard University Press and because that Press is committed to serious and important publications, we are here today.

Mr. Buck *then delivered the following remarks:*

The publication of *The Adams Papers* is easily the greatest undertaking in the history of the Harvard University Press. Hence those of us who have followed with love, care, and solicitude the ups and downs of our Press are extremely grateful for the confidence placed in us by the Adams Trust and the Massachusetts Historical Society. As we witness this present glory of the Press our gratitude is mixed with wonderment when we recall that as recently as 1945 a decision was reached in high circles that publication was not a proper function of a university and that the Harvard University Press must therefore be terminated.

The man who coined the cliché that there is no business like show business overlooked or was ignorant of the tremendous possibilities for irrational, unpredictable, and zany behavior in the field of publishing: public taste which defies understanding; a fantastic market system that to a layman seems pure anarchy; accounting methods that drive the would-be analyst into the hands of another kind of analyst; authors who are more neurotic than opera tenors.

When you transfer this circus to the University you geometrically multiply the possibility for a type of behavior which can only be observed and never understood. This is because you bring several additional unpredictable elements into the equation—the president, two governing boards, alumni, professors acting as individual authors, and professors acting in groups as departments.

Greatly as they have differed in other respects it can be said of Harvard presidents of the past century that each had these things in common: each was distinguished; each was stubborn; each derived grati-

fication in differing from his predecessor. Hence it was quite predictable that because Mr. Lowell founded the Harvard University Press in 1912 his successor Mr. Conant would in 1945 propose its demise.

A prime concern of the Harvard Corporation, and properly so, is balanced budgets. Those deans and directors who can show year by year that the operation under their charge ends in black figures can do almost anything within reason they wish to do. But let one of them fall chronically into red figures, as was true of the Harvard University Press for a sequence of years before the advent of Tom Wilson, and it will find itself the object of an undue amount of attention, mostly adverse, from the august President and Fellows of Harvard College.

It is one of the glories of Harvard that its alumni retain a keen interest in the welfare of the College, and of its various parts. The number interested in the Press is not so numerous as those concerned with football or admissions policies. But they have fully as avid an interest, and divide likewise between cranks and constructive friends. On one hand the Director of the Harvard University Press early in his tenure recognizes that he lives in a glass house, every action openly observed, fully subjected to the second guessing of Monday quarterbacks. The Harvard Archives is full of sizzling letters written in criticism of the Director. In the early twenties, for example, a certain A. W. Ryder burned with so strong a sense of outrage that he published a slim volume entitled *A Correspondence with the Harvard University Press*. The essence of his charge can be stated in this quotation:

> The Harvard Press, as conducted by its present Syndics, brings shame upon Harvard by charlatanism, profiteering, falsehood and cowardly meanness. It can be purged only by restitution of money extorted and the resignation of all its directing officers.

What triggered Ryder's anger was the fact that in ordering volume eleven in the Harvard Oriental Series, published in 1908 at $1.50, he had in 1921 been charged $2.70.

But for the most part the Press has had available to it over the years the wisdom, constructive advice, and support of an outstanding group of Harvard graduates, among whom Robert Bacon, Donald Scott, and Roy Larsen are especially worthy of mention. As one who has been on many a Harvard firing line I can testify to the fact that the job of a Dean or a Director at Harvard would be impossible except for the

understanding and support of alumni of this caliber and dedication.

So also with professors. At times they can be indescribable nuisances. The two things which concern them most are access to materials which are necessary for their teaching and research and free outlets for expression on the lecture platform or through the printed page. Any librarian who affects adversely the former or any dean or publisher who blocks the latter will quickly feel the full brunt of a highly articulate and more often than not intemperate attack.

But on balance the Faculty has been the major support of the Press, the foundation without which it could not exist. I often twit Tom Wilson with the fact that he is over-zealous in hoarding the top brass of the University in brains, experience, and influence on his Board of Directors and Board of Syndics. But it has always been so. The original Board of Syndics, appointed in 1913, included Robert Bacon (then a member of the Corporation and a key figure in convincing President Lowell to establish the Press) as Chairman; the redoubtable George Foot Moore, Professor of the History of Religion; Arthur E. Kennelly, Professor of Electrical Engineering, a giant in his field; George L. Kittredge, Professor of English, who dominated for good or bad a wide segment of the Faculty; Charles H. Thurber, a member of the firm of Ginn & Company; Edwin F. Gay, Professor of Economics and Dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration, a man who apparently had a finger in most of the important pies that were baking in his era; and the greatly respected Walter B. Cannon, Professor of Physiology.

After the first meeting of the Syndics, Kittredge wrote to Lowell:

> I congratulate you on the auspicious founding of the Harvard University Press.
>
> The Committee is a good one, and seems likely to pull together. Bacon makes an admirable chairman. . . .
>
> Dr. Thurber remarked, in the course of general discussion, that this foundation is, in his opinion, the most important step for the advancement of scholarship in America that has been taken for many years. We all agreed with him.
>
> Everyone of us felt that we were present at the birth of a great institution.

I think I understand what Kittredge felt at the first meeting of the Board of Syndics, because in later years, when I was a member of the Board, I never regretted the time devoted to the meetings even when squeezed from an extremely congested schedule. There was something

about those meetings, exhilarating in effect, which made one feel he was making a significant contribution to scholarship—even more than that—giving expression to the basic purpose for which universities exist—the transmission of learning.

Be that as it may, there have been few moments in the half-century history of the Press when its very existence was less than precarious.

A year after the Press was founded the First World War began, and with the entry of the United States in the conflict a severe threat to the Press arose. Both its first Director, C. Chester Lane, and its chief guarantor, Bacon, went off to battle. With Bacon's death in 1919 his financial guarantee lapsed. The Press confronted its first (but unfortunately not its last) great budgetary crisis. I shall spare you the details, the campaigns for funds, the schemes and the reorganizations, the restrictions forced upon publication policy because of lack of funds.

From the crisis emerged a man who with Bacon, Scott, Kittredge, Larsen, and T. J. Wilson, constitutes the builders of the Press. Harold Murdock in 1920 became Director of the Press and ushered in a constructive period of wise policy and sound growth.

But even so the seas remained turbulent and the chance of utter shipwreck remained constant.

Some problems were petty but extremely irksome. Among these was the question of nomenclature. The Press had to contend legally, unbelievable as it may seem, for the name "Harvard University Press." The so-called "University Press, John Wilson and Son, Inc." sought to restrain the College from using the name "Harvard University Press." In the 1920's a strange outfit in Chicago appeared with the name "Harvard Press, Incorporated."

Even more serious, and how well Tom Wilson will understand this, was the housing problem. The Press has never been adequately housed and it has always had to battle for the little that it had. In 1928, shortly after the Press had at considerable expense moved into the old gymnasium building, Murdock had to spend months of worry for fear that the City of Cambridge would take over the building for a fire station. Within a few years after that episode, the Press was ordered to move to a dilapidated and onetime family residence on the corner of Quincy and Broadway where the Burr Lecture Hall now stands. Of this house Murdock wrote quite plaintively to Lowell: "I yesterday went over the house on the corner of Quincy and Broad-

way. . . . It is not wired for electricity and the heating arrangements are evidently quite inadequate."

On another occasion Murdock asked that the Press be considered as a possible tenant of a factory building on the Charles River recently acquired by the University and assigned to the Maintenance Department. He received this curt reply from Mr. Lowell. "The pioneers used to stake out claims in the wilderness in unoccupied lands, and the pioneers of the Press stake them out over buildings already occupied."

Then there was the problem of perennial deficits. The ultimate figure (usually red in these pre-Wilson years) was made up of a multitude of tiny grains of sand. For example in the statement for 1933 appear these two items:

Idea of Immortality		
Sale of 1 copy		$0.51
Less expense		5.44
	Loss	$4.93
Spiritual Values		
Sale of two copies		1.27
Less expense		3.64
	Loss	2.37

But enough of this.

In 1945 a serious and justifiable question was raised by the President of the University whether the Press should be continued as an integral part of the University. He was answered convincingly in the affirmative by wise and responsible members of the Faculty and Alumni. He accepted the decision with conditions all true friends of the Press accept:

1) The Press must remain financially solvent.

2) The Press must promote true scholarship in terms defined by the University through the Board of Syndics.

3) And above all it must have a distinguished and dedicated Director.

I believe that during the past decade and a half we have fulfilled these conditions. The scholarly output of the Harvard University Press is now unequaled by any American university press. The Harvard University Press has not only fulfilled its mandate to be a hand-

maiden of scholarship, it has demonstrated how scholarship can reach new dimensions by virtue of an alert and responsive press.

But this perhaps is an internal, provincial opinion. The choice of our Press as the publisher of *The Adams Papers* is an outside confirmation of great value, and a convincing answer to those who doubt the validity of a press as an activity of a modern university.

In recent years both historical societies and university presses have been exposed to criticism and have been required to justify their right to exist and to solicit support.

I submit that the publication of *The Adams Papers* is the final answer to such criticisms.

Who but a University and a historical society dedicated to scholarship could have conceived of so vast a project on so non-commercial a basis? Who but these in partnership could have commanded the respect, understanding, and support of alumni to finance the project? Who but these could command the interest and advice of scholars to guarantee the highest standards of editorial competency?

The answers to these questions must be "None." And in that affirmation of the uniqueness of this partnership we see the ultimate justification for both the Massachusetts Historical Society and of the Harvard University Press.

On the conclusion of Mr. Buck's address, President Adams introduced the next speaker in the following words:

I now call upon Mr. Boyd of Princeton University, whose monumental *Papers of Thomas Jefferson* is a model for all subsequent major editorial projects and the criterion by which all such projects will be judged. Mr. Boyd has set a standard which all historians must admire and few editors can hope to approach. Mr. Boyd, with courage and genius and ingenuity, set out to provide the world with the definitive edition of all the writings of a great man. In the magnitude and completeness of the task he set himself there was no model and no precedent. We are honored to have him with us today because he created the model and the precedent which must hereafter be the guide and stir the emulation of all who undertake the publication of a definitive edition of historic documents.

MR. BOYD *then spoke as follows:*

President Adams, members of the Adams family, and friends of the Adams family:

We are today getting the first glimpse of a magnificent mountain range that dwarfs all others that have preceded it. This indeed calls for what the program describes with elegant simplicity as "A Ceremony." It calls for a salute of profound gratitude to all who have brought us thus far on an unprecedented voyage of historical discovery and promise—a salute to those whose enlightened action opened to the full view of scholars the total body of records of America's most distinguished public family; to the benefactors who have made this undertaking possible; to an imaginative, resourceful, and wise publisher who dared to plan boldly; and to this most venerable and honored of American historical institutions for providing the aegis for yet another of its many proud accomplishments in behalf of learning. My special office in this ceremony—and it is a most grateful one—is to salute the Meriwether Lewis of this documentary expedition and to wish him well as he prepares to assault the great Continental Divide.

The Editor in Chief of *The Adams Papers* is today surrounded by a number of other scholar-editors. We who have preceded him in the foothills and lesser ranges have some claim to special competence in appraising the editorial performance exhibited in the volumes now published. We, too, have felt the hot breath of Tutivillus on our necks. Tutivillus, you recall, was the Devil's agent who made the rounds of the scriptoria in medieval monasteries, noted down the omissions, repetitions, and garbling of the scribes' texts, and then recorded these sins against the offenders' names, thus helping to guarantee that the special section of Hell reserved for scribes and editors would be well filled. We, too, have been apprehensive of Tutivillus, for we know how easy it is to mistake "not" for "now," or "post" for "part," or "whale" for "whole," or vice versa. To foil Tutivillus is the first and most elementary duty of the editor, and it is far from being an easy task, especially when one has to deal with a handwriting as gnarled and crabbed as that of John Adams. But this is only the beginning. The editor must be willing to undergo the drudgery of guaranteeing the integrity of the text, giving scrupulous attention to

the exact letter, but he must also be a disciplined, informed, imaginative scholar in the fullest sense of the term. It is a fact neither appreciated nor fully understood in our graduate schools that scholarly editing provides a range of disciplinary exercise not matched by any other form of historical investigation. Tutivillus could fill his little black book to overflowing in any graduate seminar in our universities, but not in the editorial office of *The Adams Papers*. There he meets defeat and is obliged to report to headquarters chagrined and empty-handed.

The reason for this is clear. Lyman Butterfield is a master of his craft. He believes, indeed he knows, that his work is of the first importance. He takes an infinite delight in it. He is an editor's ideal of the scholar-editor, and at infinite cost to himself in labor and thought he has guaranteed to all of us that the text now available in a handsome format and in a scholarly context is the one that will stand. It comes as near to resolving John Adams' doubts on the historical function as we are likely to get. "I have some very solemn notions on the sanctity of history," wrote Adams, who also had solemn notions on a number of other topics. "I pretend to nothing more than to furnish materials to serve historians. It is their duty to detect my errors and appreciate every Thing according to its true value." This is a duty that the Editor in Chief of *The Adams Papers* and his colleagues have met with fidelity and distinction.

The chief reason that this is so, I think, is that Lyman Butterfield has a rather old-fashioned way of looking at things. He would feel much more comfortable, I am sure, if I spoke less of his accomplishment and more of the state of historical investigation. He would like to have me raise serious questions about the proper management of archives in this Commonwealth, about the organization and control of manuscript and archival collections, about the future of the National Historical Publications Commission, about the failure of our universities to have a share in the large editorial enterprises now under way so as to realize their potentialities for disciplinary instruction, and even about the new world of information retrieval systems that fills him with so much revulsion. This, of course, is only another way of saying that Lyman Butterfield regards his own profession in much the same responsible way that John Adams regarded the field of government. He also regards the past in an old-fashioned manner.

He looks upon an Adams, or a Rush, or a Jefferson as a human being, not as a convenient peg on which to hang a thesis. He takes pleasure in their company, he knows them intimately, he forgives them their foibles and eccentricities as he forgives those of his friends, and he cherishes them for their undeviating concern for the public interest and for understanding so clearly that in a republic the public interest is also a private interest.

As we regard this splendid enterprise and the intelligence with which it is being directed, we confront another sobering thought. We have concentrated our gaze so long on the great figures of the eighteenth century—the Washingtons, Adamses, Franklins, Madisons, and Jeffersons—that we seem to have forgotten the supremely important fact that they had an audience worthy of them, capable of electing them to positions of leadership. That audience was far more sophisticated politically than we realize. It understood to a remarkable degree both the aims of a free society and the citizen's share of responsibility in achieving these aims. "Liberty, civil and religious, has sweet and attractive charms," declared a New England clergyman in an election sermon at the close of the Revolution. "The enjoyment of this, with property, has filled the English settlers in America with a most amazing spirit, which has operated, and . . . will operate with great energy. Never before has the experiment been so effectually tried, of every man's . . . feeling his share in the aggregate system of power." Among those most responsible for diffusing this feeling among the people was John Adams, and as we embrace the opportunity now given us of appreciating more fully his own profound zeal for republican government, we might well ponder that "amazing spirit" which his audience and our ancestors once possessed.

You will forgive me, I am sure, if I close with a quotation from John Adams' great friend and coadjutor in the public interest for half a century. "A mind always employed," said Thomas Jefferson, "is [a mind] always happy." The Editor of *The Adams Papers* is in no danger of joining the intellectually unemployed, and all other editors both envy and applaud him in one of the happiest and most important of scholarly tasks. He was formed by nature for the great enterprise as no one else was.

To introduce the principal speaker of the afternoon, President Adams said:

I now call upon Mr. Bemis, who knows more about the Adams Papers than any living person, except possibly Mr. Butterfield himself. Moreover he has used them more effectively than anyone else because he has written a life of John Quincy Adams which is likely to stand for a long time, very probably for all foreseeable time, as the definitive biography. Before the family papers were generally available to historians, Mr. Bemis, because of his sincerity, because of the honesty of his purpose, gained the complete confidence of my uncle Henry Adams, then the active trustee of the papers. Never was confidence more completely justified. Mr. Bemis worked for years and finally completed the best book there is on John Quincy Adams. He justified my uncle's faith in a courageous, absolutely honest, and important historian.

Mr. Bemis *then delivered the major address of the afternoon, which he entitled:*

THE ADAMS FAMILY AND THEIR MANUSCRIPTS

In felicitating fond parents upon the birth of a son, it is a nice whimsey to exclaim: "There lies a future President of the United States. Who knows?"

Any boy born in this Republic has a constitutional right to be elected President if he lives to the age of thirty-five years and can get the votes of his fellow citizens. Many a youth or young man, conscious of his heritage of freedom, has deliberately set out to shape his life to the Presidency. Only five—perhaps now six—such people have started out in their early years to make it, and have made it: John Quincy Adams once but not again; Martin Van Buren once and never more; Theodore Roosevelt only once at the suffrage of his countrymen; Woodrow Wilson once and once again; then Franklin Delano Roosevelt once, and again, and again, and again. In only one instance—before 1961 anyway—have the parents successfully planned it that way: that was the case of John Quincy Adams. Perhaps now we shall have to add our fellow Member, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. At any rate President Kennedy is the only chief executive in the history of

the United States both of whose parents have lived to see their second son become President, however they may have originally planned. To pursue these pleasant lucubrations further: there have been only two ministers to the Court of St. James's whose sons have become President of our Republic: John Adams and Joseph P. Kennedy. Finally, both progenitors have been men of Massachusetts.

There has been only one President who has lived to see his son also become President. That was John Adams, the son, John Quincy Adams. The Adams manuscripts are the most important of all family records preserved in the United States. They comprise the diaries and letters and other papers of the three Adams statesmen, father, son, and grandson, and their respective families, brothers, sisters, cousins, aunts, and uncles—millions and millions of words. To these formidable autobiographical and epistolary foundations are constantly being added the diaries, letters, and other papers of succeeding generations of the family, for who can imagine that the Adamses will ever stop writing, and who would want them to?

We are met here this afternoon to pay our respects to the first three generations of Adams manuscripts and to the massive program of editing and printing them. To use a choice word of the two Presidents Adams, reserved for the greatest of occasions, this event constitutes an *epocha* in American historiography.

No one was more sharply conscious of the necessity of preserving historical records than old John Adams, the original patriot of the Revolution for independence; few were more irregular about the keeping and order of their own papers. Writing to Hezekiah Niles in 1818, a climactic year of the revolutions in Latin America, he mentioned the "real American Revolution." He said:

> To this end, it is greatly to be desired, that young men of letters in all the States, especially in the thirteen original States, would undertake the laborious, but certainly interesting and amusing task, of searching and collecting all the records, pamphlets, newspapers, and even handbills, which in any way contributed to change the temper and views of the people, and compose them into an independent nation.

That indeed has been the principal purpose and task of this Society.

John Adams went on to say:

> In this research, the gloriole of individual gentlemen, and of separate States, is of little consequence. The *means and the measures* are the proper objects of in-

vestigation. These may be of use to posterity, not only in this nation, but in South America and all other countries.[7]

The publication, now launched, of the Adams manuscripts by the Massachusetts Historical Society and the Harvard University Press, thanks to the financial support of Time, Incorporated, does credit a century and a half later to John Adams' farsighted interest in history, presenting the parts which he and his son and grandson, and their correspondents, official and private, played in the history of our nation.

This most prized collection of our Society embraces the Adams memory of such happenings as the voting of independence by the Continental Congress, the Franco-American alliance, the treaty of peace and independence signed by John Adams and his fellow commissioners at Paris; the foundations of American foreign policy, the Louisiana Purchase, the second treaty of peace with Great Britain signed in 1814 by John Quincy Adams, head of the American peace mission at Ghent; the Napoleonic invasion of Russia, glimpses of Napoleon himself during the Hundred Days, the framing of the Monroe Doctrine, the great Transcontinental Treaty of 1819 with Spain, recognition of the new states of Latin America, the long fight waged by John Quincy Adams against the "Gag Rule" in the House of Representatives; Manifest Destiny, the annexation of Texas, the War with Mexico; the sectional conflict over slavery; the War for Southern Independence, the controversy with Great Britain over the building of a Confederate Navy, the *Alabama* claims and the Geneva Arbitration. In it appear important letters and data on such statesmen as Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Lafayette, Hamilton, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Polk, Calhoun, Clay, Webster, Seward, Lincoln, Grant, Schurz, Tilden, Hayes, and European diplomats from Vergennes to Bryce.[8] And something on every Presidential campaign from Washington to Cleveland, including eight from 1788 to 1872 in which an Adams was a candidate, either for the Presidency or Vice Presidency.

Why had the Adams manuscripts been so long in coming forth to the eyes of the honorable community of historians? Because, in the

[7] *The Works of John Adams*, ed. C. F. Adams, X (Boston, 1856), 283.

[8] L. H. Butterfield, "The Papers of the Adams Family: Some Account of Their History," Massachusetts Historical Society, *Proceedings*, LXXI (1953–57), 328–356; and "The Adams Papers," *Daedalus*, LXXXVI (1955), 62–71.

first place, ever since John Quincy Adams contemplated writing a history of the United States and editing his patriot father's papers, the family for a century had furnished its own historians, sufficient unto themselves, so they believed. The accumulating collection of diaries and letters, incoming as well as outgoing, served as their private and exclusive historical quarry. In the Old House at Quincy, John Quincy Adams, returning from the White House in Washington, first labored with his son at arranging and editing his father's papers. Soon the fierce political struggles of his Second Career diverted him from the task, but Charles Francis Adams finally published (in 1850-1856) the ten-volume edition of the *Works* of John Adams, including *selected* letters and *selected* passages from his diaries and autobiographies. This expensive and ill-arranged publication was supported (like the first editions of selected papers of Washington and Jefferson) by an appropriation of Congress to purchase 1,000 copies of the set for $22,500. Until very recently these volumes have remained the principal source for biographers of John Adams. Only now are historians, such as Merrill Jensen and Stephen G. Kurtz, finding in the unpublished papers of John Adams, recently microfilmed, the yeast that raised the old patriot's public loaf and private dander.

Charles Francis Adams, after his great service as a diplomatist, crowned by his notable work on the Geneva Arbitration Tribunal, like his father John Quincy Adams before him in the case of grandfather John Adams, turned to the task of editing and publishing the famous Diary of *his* own famous father, namely John Quincy Adams himself. It appeared in 1874-1877 in twelve stout octavo volumes under the title, *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, Comprising Portions of his Diary from 1795 to 1848*.

It is not too much to say that John Quincy Adams' full Diary is the greatest personal record ever set down by an American statesman in the Western Hemisphere. It stretches with very few gaps over seventy years: from November 12, 1779, when he embarked with his father a second time for Europe, to January 4, 1848, in the midst of the Mexican War. The title page of one of his earliest diary booklets contains a quotation from Voltaire: *La mollesse est douce et sa suite est cruelle*. The author lived up to that warning. The holograph diary of some 3,000,000 words is a monument of physical labor and self-discipline.

A detailed critical study of this Diary, as printed and as still unprinted, has never been made. It was first of all a record for his own reference, and as such it proved useful in many a controversy. It also served as a release for ulcerous judgments on his political opponents in a time when to say these things out loud might mean a pistol duel. Above all, John Quincy Adams considered it a history of his life, both the outer man and the inner man, for the edification of his descendants. It would not seem that he wrote it for later publication, certainly not in the unstudied form and style in which he put it down. But perhaps one day one of his sons would prepare it for publication, winnowing out the wheat from the chaff.

As for his own appraisal of this record of his life, stated in characteristic Adamsian elevated disillusion and profession of ultimate failure, John Quincy Adams wrote: "If my intellectual powers had been such as have been sometimes committed by the Creator of man to single individuals of the species, my Diary would have been, next to the Holy Scriptures, the most precious and valuable book ever written by human hands, and I should have been one of the greatest benefactors of my country and of mankind. I would, by the irresistible power of genius and the irrepressible energy of will and the favor of Almighty God, have banished war and slavery from the face of the earth forever. But the conceptive power of mind was not conferred on me by my Maker, and I have not improved the scanty portion of His gifts as I might and ought to have done."

I should guess that the published portion would measure up in wordage as the smaller half of the whole record, though by far the more important half. Charles Francis Adams included all that he felt to be of historical value illustrative of his father's public life, with copious passages to give an adequate idea of character and personality. Where the editor felt doubtful about the historical value of a passage he included it, even though it seemed personal. But the question remains: on what passages did he feel doubtful, and on what not doubtful? The quick and ready way in which the filial editor did the selection leaves much to be desired. He simply penciled parentheses around the passages to be printed and then turned the manuscript text over to the printer: no editing, no explanation. One can't thus chop across threads of a mingled skein that runs through a life. Much of the man and his personal travail is missing from these printed

Memoirs. As to the accuracy of the printing, I know of no check that has been made; certainly it must be fallible. Now, the unexpurgated product of the whole loom, public woof and private warp, is to be printed later on in the voluminous series being launched today.

The significance of the *Memoirs* to their editor Charles Francis Adams is attested by a poignant passage from his own unprinted Diary: "Yesterday was a memorable day . . . for the reception of the twelfth and last volume of my father's Diary. . . . I am now perfectly ready to go myself."

One thing seems sure about the twelve volumes: financially they must have become a worrisome white elephant for Lippincott, the publisher, for we know of no subvention, from the family or otherwise, that supported them.

In addition to the Diary, there is the tremendous quantity of correspondence, public and private, largely out of his own letterbooks, supplemented by a mass of incoming letters on all kinds of subjects from all kinds of people. In contrast to the irregular methods of his father, John Adams, John Quincy Adams kept this correspondence in a most systematic way. Such matter mounted to its greatest quantity during the second Adams' years in Congress and his crusades for the right of petition and the restriction of slavery in the territories—his so-called Second Career.

This material has already had considerable scholarly attention. In 1909 the son of Charles Francis Adams, by name Charles Francis Adams of course, whom we shall call CFA II to distinguish him from CFA I and CFA III, hired Worthington C. Ford away from the Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress to serve as archivist and editorial consultant of the Adams Family. Ford also acted as Editor of this Society from 1909 to 1929.[9] During his prodigious labors in this building Mr. Ford incidentally published a dozen or so articles of choice or disparate selections drawn from the Adams Manuscripts, which since 1902 had reposed here off this room. Ford's most ambitious project was the editing, in what he estimated

[9] In 1929 Mr. Ford retired from the Massachusetts Historical Society on a pension, and accepted the position of European Representative of the Library of Congress, in succession to the author of these remarks. The Second World War and the occupation of France by Nazi Germany suspended the work of the Mission, and Ford died at sea in 1941 while returning home. The editing of the various series selected from the Adams Papers was only a small portion of the total volume of his historical work. A life of Ford with an appraisal of his scholarly activities much needs to be done.

would run to twelve volumes, of the *Writings of John Quincy Adams*, presenting selections of his most significant letters public and private, with illustrative footnotes from relevant incoming letters and a moderate selection of John Quincy Adams' other writings. This edition, published by Macmillan between 1913 and 1917, had advanced to seven volumes carrying the selected documents through September, 1823, when the publication was discontinued during the First World War. Although its cessation has never been fully explained, it would seem that the exigencies of war and financial uncertainty about further volumes had a good deal to do with it. In due course, it will be resumed and perhaps entirely replaced by a whole new edition of the Writings of John Quincy Adams as a part of the great publication now coming up.

Ford's printed volumes as far as published have been of enormous value to students of the period, many of whom, like myself, yearned to look at the documents which Ford saw fit to omit in his effort to condense the publication to practical limits. Curiously enough, and perhaps significantly, Ford never said a word about the provenance of these letters. Maybe it was feared that too much information on this head might lead to too many applications from outside historical scholars for unprinted documents reposing among the family archives. Ford's own discretion as to publication seems to have been greatly curtailed following the death of Charles Francis Adams II in 1915, the last of the family historians—so far.

We may now look forward to publication in due time in our new enterprise, under the expert editorship of Professor and Mrs. David H. Donald of Princeton, of the Diary of the family editor of the first two Adamses, namely that of Charles Francis Adams himself. It stretches over sixty years, 1820-1880. It is nearly as voluminous, and certainly more even, if cooler, in literary quality, as if the author were conscious that some day one of *his* sons might publish much of it, at least those portions touching on public affairs. It is a political record foreign and domestic of a tremendous period of American history, notably of the sectional conflict, the Civil War, and the diplomatic aftermath of the war, culminating in the Geneva Arbitration. For the years 1820 to 1847 the diaries of father and son overlap and become an indispensable source to biographers of both statesmen.

The great mass of Charles Francis Adams' correspondence, letter-

books and incoming letters, also rivals the corresponding files of John Quincy Adams in value to the historian of his period. This material too will take its place among the future volumes of *The Adams Papers*.

We recall that Charles Francis Adams had four distinguished sons: John Quincy Adams, the Democrat, and the three eminent historians: the incomparable Henry Adams, who of course had access to the Adams Manuscripts but did not make so much use of them as he might have done in his masterly *History*, and his historian brothers Brooks Adams, and Charles Francis Adams II already introduced.

President John Quincy Adams has been said to have had two great careers. His grandson Charles Francis Adams II had three. After a successful military career during the Civil War he had a second spectacular career in railroad management, and finally a notable third career as historian and President of this Society. Following outstanding achievements in the service of Clio, such as his *Three Episodes of Massachusetts History*, his articles on Anglo-American relations during the Civil War, and the short biography of his diplomat father, he took upon himself the task of doing for the Diary and papers of Charles Francis Adams I what the latter had done for John Adams and John Quincy Adams. Charles Francis Adams II projected more than that: he planned to supplement this collection with documents copied out of the diplomatic records of the Department of State in Washington, the Foreign Office in London, and the private papers of Lord Palmerston, British Prime Minister during our Civil War, and the Foreign Minister, Lord Russell. He conceived of it as a multi-volume work of the magnitude of Nicolay and Hay's ten-volume documentary biography of Abraham Lincoln. He labored at this task until with his increasing years and depleted health the great work broke down under its own massive weight. As a young graduate student, I can remember the old gentleman (whose portrait hangs on the wall of our staircase) moving about in the alcoves of the Society during the last months of his life—I regret I never dared to speak to him.

From what has been said it is evident that for the two Presidents, the Adams historians published or caused to be published (as in the case of Ford's renditions) a major part of their papers which relate to their public life; but for Charles Francis Adams, nothing.

We have noted the fact that in 1902 the Adams Manuscripts had been transferred from the Stone Library in the garden of the Old

House at Quincy to the custody—*but not the control or use*—of this Society, where they were impounded for a minimum of fifty years in the Adams Manuscript Trust. After the family historians passed from the scene the more recently co-opted Adams trustees knew less and less about the contents of their trust and were more and more preoccupied with their own busy affairs. They were particularly sensitive to a new school of writers seeking sensational copy to debunk great men by a display of their petty human qualities. Such exhibitionists were prone to exploit human weaknesses rather than strength of character. And who knew what family skeletons might be hidden in the Adams Room! Here was another reason for keeping the collection closed to outsiders.

Ever since the days of Mercy Warren and that journalistic pest Anne Royall, the Adamses, beginning with John Adams and John Quincy Adams, had had a horror of female publicists. Miss Royall was the reporter who had annoyed John Quincy Adams in the White House, and is said further—I never could find any good authority for it—once to have followed him down and sat on his clothes and refused to go away until he promised, from the then translucent protection of the Potomac River, to give her an interview when he got back to the White House. When in the age of jazz certain penwomen began to do what amounted to "profiles" of the Adamses it became absolutely impossible for any woman to break through the barrier. As late as our own times even that superlative writer Catherine Drinker Bowen could not use John Adams' papers for her lively volume on *John Adams and the American Revolution.*

When I first began work on John Quincy Adams, the trustees were: Charles Francis Adams III, Secretary of the Navy under President Hoover and Treasurer of Harvard University, and his cousin Henry Adams II, nephew of the illustrious historian of that name. Henry Adams II in his retirement from business served as the family vigilator over the collection. He was twin brother of John Adams, the recent President of this Society, who rendered such signal service during some very trying years. The spitting image of his great-grandfather John Quincy Adams, Henry Adams II was devoting nearly all his time to the Adams Manuscripts, and trying to carry on the massive enterprise which had weighed down his father, Charles

Francis Adams II, the great work on Charles Francis Adams I and the Civil War.

Henry Adams II was rather deaf and had the reputation among some young and impatient scholars of being unreasonable and crotchety. The staff of this Society, who came into contact with him almost daily, did not altogether share this opinion. I certainly never found him really difficult. I worked at a desk there by the window in this great room, then a museum, and he remained watchfully at his desk and typewriter in the exclusive Adams Room, over opposite. When he went out he locked the door of the treasure trove and took the key with him. As I gained his confidence he would leave the key with me, finally leave the door open so I could go in and get whatever I needed, provided I would lock up and put the key in an agreed place when I went out for lunch. Now what do you think of that, for a fellow hailing from what Cotton Mather called "the wrong side of the hedge"?

I can still picture Henry Adams II coming in from Concord of a frosty winter morning, his pale blue eyes running from the cold, rubbing his hands briskly, unlocking the door, opening the window of the inner Adams sanctum and unbolting the iron fireproof and thiefproof shutters one high story up from the ground alleyway. Sometimes he would speak to me, sometimes not. I soon came to feel that this made no difference in his inner friendliness and developing interest in my work and concern for its success. Then he would bring out the volume or volumes of manuscripts for which I was waiting. While I was reading, he would be busy on some concern of his own, answering inquiries, copying passages for scholars, studying Civil War documents for himself, or perhaps wandering around among earlier Adams manuscripts. Sometimes he would get so absorbed in these old family letters that he would almost talk to their authors, certainly to himself: "Confound it! [At least so I remember his words at this distance of time.] Abigail shouldn't have said that!" Or, "the old man should have known better." When I once referred to the "old man," Henry Adams quickly reacted: "In the family we can call him that, but other people shouldn't." He didn't seem to mind, however, when I spoke of "the Old Man Eloquent."

Mr. Adams became a real friend, and we had the pleasure of entertaining him a couple of week ends in New Haven. He was particu-

larly interested in comparing the students of Adams House at Harvard College, where he was a Fellow, with those of Saybrook College at Yale, where I was a Fellow. Once I took him to a picnic of the Saybrook undergraduates, a rollicking occasion on the country greensward, the boys and girls imbued with the sap of Spring, under the thin chaperonage of the Fellows. The antics didn't faze him a bit: on the contrary. I am sure he had once felt, like the Adamses before him (their unprinted manuscripts show it), like the Adamses after him, I presume, and like all of us certainly, the sap of Spring.

It became increasingly evident to Mr. Adams that the papers under his charge were acquiring more and more importance to the world of modern scholarship. The burden of his responsibility as family vigilator became ever more heavy as he tried, singlehandedly, to take care of all the requests and inquiries coming in. I was somewhat shocked to hear him say one day as he came out of his den and turned the key: "I wish Hitler would drop one of his bombs right in the middle of all this!" When I remonstrated, he professed to be serious. If anybody else had suggested such a means of solving his problem, he doubtless would have blown his top.

"What do the historians think of our policy of keeping these papers closed?" he asked me one day. By then I knew him well enough to tell him frankly: "They don't think much of it; they contrast it with unrestricted access to the papers of Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, Monroe, and those of many another great American, long since open to scholars, in the Library of Congress, and elsewhere."

I have no doubt that he was discussing this matter with his fellow trustee, "Charlie" Adams, as he called his eminent cousin, Charles Francis Adams III. It was clear that the family could no longer carry the burden of editing and publishing, of caring for the Adams houses in Quincy, the Stone Library there behind the Old House, and the responsibility to scholars and to the nation involved in the custody of the Adams Manuscripts here in the Adams Room. The problem of the ancestral houses they solved by turning them over to the City of Quincy and to the United States Government as historical monuments. But that did not take care of responsibility for handling and use of these precious manuscripts. Once the faithful Henry should pass from the scene, there would be nobody available in the family to give personal attention to the documents. The family would have

either to lock them up altogether or unload them from its own bosom in a way to keep them intact for the whole nation. And the Adamses have always been men of the whole nation.

After the death of Henry Adams II in 1951, two new and young trustees came into the Trust, Mr. Thomas Boylston Adams, President of our Society today, and his cousin Mr. John Quincy Adams. These young men did not profess to be historians but they knew historians and trusted them. They had sensed the high principles, character, and canons of scholarship prevailing in the historical profession in the United States, such as we see embodied in the American Historical Association and its affiliated groups. They called in some professional historical scholars to advise them. The trustees almost stunned their guests by proposing a giant first step, a program of microfilming the entire corpus, every piece and fragment large and small of the Adams manuscripts through the year 1889. It would be a self-sustaining enterprise, supported by subscription of the larger libraries in American cities and universities, strategically located over this whole continental republic. Begun in 1952, this mighty labor, well organized and competently executed, was completed in 1959. Already it has begun to pollenize historical research in this country and abroad. There has developed a veritable cult of Adams history and biography.

Next the new trustees called in a group of scholars to help shape a great decision: publication of the papers of the three Adams statesmen. In 1950 President Harry S. Truman, inspired by the launching of Mr. Julian P. Boyd's marvelous edition of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson,* had recently given impetus to the work of the National Historical Publications Commission, a quasi-governmental agency, by urging publication of similar complete and scholarly editions of other great Americans' papers in the comprehensive form of Boyd's *Jefferson.* Mr. Truman's proposal had a dynamic effect: practically a publication explosion. First to be set on foot were the papers of Benjamin Franklin (to be noted more particularly), then the Adams Manuscripts, followed by Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, James Madison, Henry Clay, John C. Calhoun, Andrew Johnson, James K. Polk, Woodrow Wilson, and George Catlett Marshall, to cite outstanding projects under way; with plans being formulated for the papers of Albert Gallatin, Henry Laurens, John Marshall, George Mason, William Penn, and Daniel Webster—together with large collections

such as the Papers of the Continental Congress, papers on the Ratification of the Constitution, the Naval Records of the Revolution, etc.[10] These projects are all being sponsored by universities, historical societies, and various governmental agencies, some of them assisted by private endowments like the Franklin and Adams enterprises financed by Time, Inc.

First fruits of the Adams enterprise, sponsored by our Society, published by The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, and supported by funds from Time, Inc., on behalf of *Life* magazine, are presented to the public today. It may well be asked why a great publishing firm, whose business is popular journalism, should put large sums of money into scholarly enterprises of this kind. The basic reason is that the top management of that publishing company and the editors of *Life* believe that their readers, though they number in millions, want to see some of the real stuff of history. *Life,* as you know, has already printed selections from the documents out of the capacious stores that the Adams editors have assembled, and more will be printed from time to time. Our editors must find this deeply heartening. What other scholars have ever had so wide an audience? What other audience so extensive has ever had such genuine and meticulously prepared historical materials placed before it?

I am happy to pause here to mention particularly the great publication of the Franklin Papers now going on at Yale, in partnership with the American Philosophical Society and financed by *Life* magazine, under the editorship of my distinguished colleague and fellow Corresponding Member of this Society, Professor Leonard W. Labaree, and his associates. Although the Franklin factory in the Sterling Memorial Library got into gear a little earlier than the Adams shop here, the latter enterprise with these four volumes has already caught up with it, but the fourth Franklin volume, now being indexed from the page proof, will appear later this year, and a fifth volume has gone to press.

In this noble, growing family of publication of American statesmen and patriots certainly the Adamses are illustrious companions. We are happy to pay tribute to them, to their sponsors in print, and to their capable editor and his associates in a lifetime job for all concerned.

The first step in the publication program was outright conveyance

[10] National Historical Publications Commission, *Tenth Anniversary* . . . (New York, 1960).

to the Massachusetts Historical Society in the spring of 1956 of all the Adams Papers which had been placed on its premises in 1902. The family was now free of a great burden, and a great responsibility, with the papers preserved for posterity and made available to anybody everywhere, and the Editor equipped with proper place and atmosphere in which to work. All these sequences of the Adams publication occurred, to use Mr. Butterfield's own words, "almost with the speed of a nuclear chain reaction."

What does this great dissemination of Adams Papers, already in microfilm and today beginning to appear in book form, have to reveal to historians that has not already been exhibited in the numerous printed works put forth by the Adams historians and their helpers during more than a century past?

Take the case of John Adams, illustrated by the four volumes published today. He was what we might call in today's parlance the theoretician of the American Revolution and self-government. No man is better entitled to be called the Father of the Revolution. As an analyst of men and measures, and as an exploiter of human springs and motives of government, he might also be called, in the best sense of the appellation, the American Machiavelli. He was sponsor of the balance of power built into three separate branches of government, executive, legislative, and judicial, to protect the liberties of the people. This balance has become the enduring pattern of the American structure of government, state and federal. He was a man of complete honesty and full integrity. But most students of his life and times would concede that with his superlative native ability and literary qualities, there was also an excessive personal pride, egotism, jealousy, and pomposity of character and carriage. Such is the image left by the general histories of the period. The hitherto unprinted diary fragments, and private letters, of the women as well as the men of the Adams family, will throw floods of light on the human qualities of the first President Adams that will soften the public image.

Charles Francis Adams, in editing the *Works* of his patriot grandfather, had cut out such pieces and passages as he thought insignificant or in questionable taste by Victorian standards. The grandson omitted much that is colorful in John Adams' own language and activities, exceedingly important for the biographer who would give us a full portrait of the man as seen by his family and neighbors: re-

ports of village life in Braintree, fishing expeditions, ship-launching festivities, droll stories, and country characters. Mr. Butterfield cites some spicy examples in his scholarly preface in Volume I. John Adams was a devoted farmer whenever he could get the time from public business. But Charles Francis Adams thought that farming was too plebeian an occupation to warrant much reader interest.

There is also in the unpublished letters of John Adams, which we may expect to see in printed form as publication advances beyond the Adams Diaries, an amount of new detail on his diplomatic activity, supplemented by his official despatches—particularly relating to his negotiations in the Netherlands, with occasional digs at Franklin. Perhaps a case might be made for John Adams as more realistic on some political and diplomatic issues than Franklin, and shrewder in his political thinking than his friend Jefferson.

The remarkable correspondence of John Adams with his son the Secretary of State and President, still unprinted, on history, politics, philosophy, science, and religion, will be published for the first time in this great series. John Adams in his long years of retirement read just about everything there was both in the classics and in modern letters. He claimed to be the original Unitarian in Massachusetts: but the son, also a Unitarian, confessed to a smack of orthodoxy. John Quincy Adams thought that all Christian faiths, Protestant or Catholic, were seeking the same destination by different roads. In one of his last letters to his President son, the Elder Statesman John Adams summed up all his long readings and ponderings in a lesson of two indelible words: "Be good!"

Copious as the quantity is of already printed material of the Diary and papers of John Quincy Adams, I can testify to the richness of the unprinted papers. Take, for example, the second Adams' correspondence both outgoing and incoming during his years as Secretary of State, as President, and during his long, second, career in Congress. They are full of unused material for the political, economic, and social historian, and for the history of science in the United States, that has scarcely been touched except cursorily in the recent biography.

To me as a biographer, the unprinted portions of the Diary were most revealing: the neurotic health of Mrs. Adams and incompatibility of temper between the two loving spouses which made their years in the White House so miserable a sojourn; the sudden death of their

ill-fated first-born, George Washington Adams, a tragedy which made of John Quincy Adams a veritable American Job; details of the dramatic death of the Old Man Eloquent in the House of Representatives; the circumstances of his national obsequies and burial at Quincy. All these poignant chapters of his extraordinary life would be mostly unknown to the biographer who relied, as early biographers had to rely, on the published documents. And there are the reams of unpublished verse; but here I forbear. No more should be published.

The recent biographies, of *Charles Sumner and the Coming of the Civil War,* by Professor David H. Donald, and of *Charles Francis Adams,* by my scholarly young colleague Dr. Martin B. Duberman, demonstrate the importance of the third generation of Adams manuscripts to current historical scholarship. Beyond its biographical importance, this great collection of the papers of Charles Francis Adams 1 presents a rich spread of source material for historians of the Rhodes and Nevins period of American historiography: the antislavery side of the sectional conflict, the breakdown of party lines, the Civil War, and its aftermath of Reconstruction. We may be sure that historians to come will make the most of it.

To come back to our late friend Henry Adams II. I once asked him if he thought there might be presidential timber in present or future generations of the family stock.

He paused to ponder this carefully, as if to make a survey. Then he said: "Yes."

In concluding the meeting, President Adams said:

I want to comment on just two points in Mr. Bemis' address. First of all I want to tell you what really happened at the alleged interview with Anne Royall. I do not know whether it is really true, as Mr. Bemis cannot bring himself to believe, that Anne Royall sat one day on the old gentleman's clothes while J. Q. Adams was swimming in the Potomac, but if she did sit on his clothes, I know exactly what happened. I know that she did not get any interview by blackmail. The reason is perfectly simple. My family has never held with the curious custom of putting on clothes to get wet. When they want to swim they take their clothes off. I know this is a family custom be-

cause I practice it myself, and I am merely doing as my grandfather did before me when he used to dive into the waters of Massachusetts Bay off of The Glades rocks. I have no doubt that he inherited the habit directly from his grandfather. I know with positive certainty that if Anne Royall did sit on J. Q. Adams' clothes, he simply swam ashore, came out of the water, walked over to her, and said, "Young woman, go away."

Lastly, I am fascinated by Mr. Bemis' suggestion that a diary is a satisfactory substitute for fighting and dueling. I therefore suggest that we here and now subscribe a fund for the purchase of two blank books—one to go to "Mr. K." in Moscow and the other to go to "Mr. K." in Washington.

I now invite you to join me upstairs, where Mr. Riley in his usual quiet and effective way has provided for your refreshment.

The ceremony at the Massachusetts Historical Society was formally adjourned at 4:45 P.M. In the evening The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press gave a dinner at the American Academy of Arts and Sciences so that the many publishers who had attended the afternoon ceremony would have an opportunity to meet members of the Adams family, of the Society, and others who were closely associated with *The Adams Papers*. After dinner brief addresses were given by Messrs. Adams, Pusey, and Wilson.

Annual Meeting

OCTOBER, 1961

THE Society met in the Dowse Library at three o'clock in the afternoon of Thursday, October 19, 1961, President Adams in the chair.

The record of the stated meeting of May 11 was read and approved.

The President reported the death on August 21, 1961, of Sir Charles Kingsley Webster,[11] elected a Corresponding Member on February 9, 1933.

[11] For an obituary, see *The Times* (London), Aug. 23, 1961, p. 10.

It was voted to transfer to Associate Membership from Resident Membership Harold Bowditch, of Peterborough, New Hampshire, and William Goodwin Renwick, of Tucson, Arizona, due to their removal from Massachusetts.

Robert Roswell Palmer, of Princeton, New Jersey, was elected to Corresponding Membership, Mr. Brinton acting as Sponsor.

Waldo Gifford Leland, of Washington, D. C., elected a Resident Member on December 11, 1952, was elected by unanimous voice vote an Honorary Member, Mr. Metcalf acting as Sponsor.

James Jackson Minot, of Beverly, was elected a Resident Member, Mr. Bradlee acting as Sponsor.

The stated meeting then adjourned, and the Annual Meeting was called to order without perceptible change in the appearance of the Dowse Library and its occupants.

On behalf of the Nominating Committee, Mr. Hamilton presented the following nominations for the year 1961–1962:

President

Thomas Boylston Adams

Vice-Presidents

Henry Latimer Seaver
Stephen Wheatland

Recording Secretary

Walter Muir Whitehill

Corresponding Secretary

James Barr Ames

Treasurer

John Bryant Paine, Jr.

Cabinet-Keeper

Edward Pierce Hamilton

Members-at-Large of the Council
1961–1964

Frederick Scouller Allis, Jr.
Bernard Bailyn

There being no other nominations, it was voted that the Recording Secretary cast one vote for the above Officers, who were then declared duly elected.

Mr. Paine read the

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

AS Treasurer of the Massachusetts Historical Society, I submit herewith my report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

Financially this past year has again been a favorable one for the Society, although, as was expected, the rate of improvement set in the three preceding years was not maintained.

The plan of nearly two years ago to raise eventually $49,000 for the Building Fund was achieved this year. Actually, $53,203 were received from contributions by Members and friends. An additional $3,946 were available from income received by Norcross Fund, I, which may be used for the upkeep of the Society's property and collections. Of this total of $57,149, all but $1,354 has been used or is committed to completing the alterations originally planned.

As pointed out last year, we owe a great debt of gratitude to the family and friends of our late Member Peter Oliver, whose contributions, which are included in these figures, totaled over $13,000. Many other friends who were not Members of the Society were also generous contributors. We are particularly indebted to our architect and Member, James Lawrence, Jr., our President, Thomas B. Adams, our Director, Stephen T. Riley, and our Cabinet-Keeper, Edward P. Hamilton, all of whom gave so generously of their time and talent to achieve the magnificent results these funds made possible.

So complimentary have been the reactions of all who have seen what has been accomplished in the past two years to improve the attractiveness of the present reading room, the Oliver Room, and the lower hallways, that we hope in the not too distant future, when funds permit, to bring one remaining room into keeping with the others. This room has almost equal possibilities and would be used to house the Henry Adams library and the Society's collection of maps. It is the large room at the left of the main entrance, similar in shape to our Director's office directly over it on the second floor. Funds remaining in Norcross Fund, I, available for this project total $1,354.

During this year, the Endowment Fund was increased by $6,095 to total $95,915. Of this increase, $5,000 were the bequest of our late Member Lee M. Friedman. Donations and credits from sales added to the Library Fund totaled $10,315, and this Fund now amounts to $13,685. During the year, $10,000 were added to the Saltonstall Fund, which was started last year with a contribution of $1,000 and is to be used by the Society to help defray the costs of publishing a volume of Saltonstall papers. The Paine Publication Fund was increased by $600.

The same Finance Committee was reappointed in November, 1960, to serve for 1960–1961: John Bryant Paine, Jr., *Chairman*; Thomas Boylston Adams, William Henry Claflin, and Henry Lee Shattuck. Brown, Bacall & Company was again named to audit the Society's books, as it has for the past nineteen years.

Income from investments available for Society purposes for this past year 1960–1961 showed practically no increase and totaled $109,122, compared to an increase of 15.4% the year before. However, in the four-year period since 1957, when the present Finance Committee was first appointed, annual income has increased from $75,861 for the year ended June 30, 1957, or approximately 43.8%. Some of this increase of income was due to net additions to principal totaling $174,612 during the period, but by far the larger part resulted from changes of investments. The income received in this latest period amounts to 3.3% of the market value of investments on June 30, 1961, compared with 3.7% the year before. The market value of our investments on June 30, 1961, totaled $3,290,391, compared to $2,320,286 four years ago. After deducting net additions to principal during that period from the current appraisal, market appreciation since 1957 totaled 34.3%. Again, the Treasurer feels that a debt of gratitude is owed by the Society to the other members of the Finance Committee for their able advice and for the time they have given so generously to its affairs.

Additional changes of investments resulted in a further increase of book values as indicated below:

Book Value June 30, 1961	*Book Value June 30, 1960*	*Increase*
$2,052,107	$1,941,626	$110,481

A comparison of market values of the Society's investments follows:

	June 30, 1961	%	*June 30, 1960*	%
Bonds, including U. S. Treasury Bills	$1,058,032	32.2	$1,004,424	33.9
Common Stocks	2,223,957	67.6	1,938,080	65.5
Cash Bank Balance	8,402	0.2	18,948	0.6
	$3,290,391	100.0	$2,961,452	100.0

	$3,290,391	
	−2,961,452	
	+$328,939	
Net additions to principal	$26,741	
Less charges to Building Fund	−16,464	
	$10,277	
Deduct:		
Net contributions	$10,277	
Increase	$318,662	(+10.8%)

General and administrative expenses for the two years compare as follows:

	1961	*1960*
Salaries	$53,042	$45,829
Agency and auditor's fees	6,200	5,884
Meetings and membership	1,552	788
Library	6,007	6,122
Building	10,096	7,725
	$76,897	$66,348

General and administrative expenses increased $10,549 or 15.9%. The increase of salaries to $53,042 was anticipated in my report of last year in connection with engaging at that time a full-time assistant librarian, and several salary increases that became effective near the end of that year. As a result of several salary adjustments put into effect on May 1, 1961, salaries were increased by an additional $2,300, most of which will reflect in next year's expenses. On the other hand, the $2,371 increase of building expenses represented a nonrecurring charge in connection with major repairs to twenty-two chairs and to our elevator and heating system.

Additional expenses and disbursements, not included above, in the amount of $51,879 were charged to the income of specific funds. Of this amount, $3,385 covered the cost of publishing Volume XXXIII,

Part 2 (1757) of the *Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts*, of which amount $2,250 were refunded by the State in payment for 300 copies. The cost of publishing Volume XI (1741–1745) of *Sibley's Harvard Graduates* was $7,309, while $1,753 represented the cost of publishing the Paul Revere Picture Book. Since contributions to the Building Fund have been added to the accumulated income of the Norcross Fund, I, expenses during the year for the building renovations program totaling $37,542 were charged to this Fund.

Our operating deficits for some years now have been covered by the current income of the Sibley Fund even in years when a volume of *Sibley's Harvard Graduates* was published, as was true this past year, when this deficit totaled $10,151. Nevertheless, despite the increase of general and administrative expenses already discussed, $183 were carried into the accumulated income of the Sibley Fund. Normally these volumes have been published once in every three years, although, since another volume is practically ready, we will probably publish it this current year. The accumulated income of the Sibley Fund really represents our only source of surplus with which to cover operating deficits, should these exceed the current Sibley Fund income. However, in recent years we were fortunate that it was not necessary to draw from it. Instead, since 1957 this surplus has been allowed to increase by 105% and now amounts to $61,020 available for a leaner period which may face our economy in the not too distant future.

These figures and comparisons do not reflect the investments and income therefrom of the Adams Papers Editorial and Microfilm Funds. Details of these Funds and complete details of the Society's financial affairs appear in the auditor's report on file at the Society.

The Director then read the

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

JUST a year ago we opened our new reading room to scholars. The pleasure and comfort it has given them and the Staff has exceeded even our most sanguine expectations. While we knew that in the past our visitors liked working here despite the crowded and cluttered quarters then available, it has been a source of deep satisfaction to us during the past months to hear their enthusiastic comments on the

changes that have taken place. And since scholars enjoy talking at least as much as other people, I should not be surprised if word of the changes has reached India and Brazil, for we did have readers from not only twenty-seven states, but four continents as well.

The subjects that these 1,600 readers worked on were as diverse as their place of origin. A sampling follows: The Winthrop Family; The Saltonstall Family; King Philip's War in Maine; The Poetry of Edward Taylor; Brewing in Colonial Times; Thomas Morton of Merrymount; Daniel Gookin; Seventeenth-century Gardens; Witches; Early American Bookbindings; Simon Bradstreet; Francis Nicolson; Colonial Silversmiths; William Douglass; The Great Awakening; The Stamp Act; Francis Bernard; The Boston Tea Party; Thomas Jefferson; Eighteenth-century Voyages to the Northwest Coast; Nathanael Greene; Mathew Carey; Madame de Riedesel; Elbridge Gerry; Count Rumford; Fisher Ames; Bank of North America; Federalist Party in Massachusetts; Marine Insurance; Various Adamses —John, Abigail, Samuel, John Quincy, Louisa, Catherine, Charles Francis, I, Charles Francis, II, Henry, and Brooks; Trade with India; New England Transcendentalism; Talleyrand; History of the British Empire; Boston and the Mexican War; Treatment of the Insane in Nineteenth-century Massachusetts; Gettysburg Campaign; Legal History of Virginia; History of the Supreme Court; E. L. Godkin; Robert Owen; Franco-American Relations in the Nineteenth Century; History of American Economic Thought; The United States Navy in the East; League of Nations; Boston Police Strike; Warren G. Harding; Role of Artists in the Sacco-Vanzetti Case; and, of course, George Frisbie Hoar.

The largest manuscript collection acquired this year was the collection of Senator Hoar's papers. It took the combined efforts of the men on the Society's Staff and the Adams Papers Staff to gather the papers together and transport them to the Society from the Worcester house. The collection was scarcely off the truck before scholars were arriving to use the papers. At least six people have signified their intention of working on some aspect of Senator Hoar's life. Perhaps the most interesting single document acquired recently is a letter from John Higginson to the Massachusetts General Court, dated at Salem, June 6, 1663. The postscript to the letter is hardly a plea for religious freedom:

I do further entreate that the honored Court will please to consider what course may be taken for the dissolving of the Quaker meetings here which we have frequent and constant without interruption a long time, strang Quakers often repairing hither, that occasion may be given for others abroad to looke upon Salem as a nest of Quakers from hence to infect the rest of the country.

We have added some 1,345 new titles to our collection of printed books, many falling into our special field of Massachusetts printing before 1826.[12] Various Members have helped greatly by turning over to the library current books on American history and biography. We are especially grateful to Thomas J. Wilson, Alfred A. Knopf, and Henry A. Laughlin for their interest and help in this phase of our work.

The coming of John D. Cushing as my assistant in the library was a happy day for the Society. In the past year he has accomplished wonders in diminishing the backlog of jobs waiting to be done. With his help many of our unused and duplicate books have been sold and the proceeds added to the Library Fund. We are continuing to bind our reference books and at last are making a start on the rebinding of our rare books. The first shipment of 100 books was sent to an English binder a month or so ago. New boxes have been purchased for our prints, and the work of transferring them from the old tattered folders is now going on.

While Malcolm Freiberg, our Editor and a man extremely useful to the Society in many other ways, will give his own report on the publications of the Society, I should like to mention the gift to the Society by the Saltonstall family of $10,000 to pay for the cost of publishing a volume of Saltonstall papers. Senator Saltonstall, our Member, was instrumental in raising this sum. Robert Earle Moody, also a Member, has been chosen to edit the volume. On the table is a reproduction by The Meriden Gravure Company of our original water color, Christian Remick's "Perspective View of the Blockade of Boston," 1768, the first of a series of reproductions we hope to issue.

[12] Complete figures for printed accessions during the year 1960–1961 are as follows:

Books	358
Pamphlets	109
Periodicals	636
Broadsides	71
Newspapers	167
Maps	4
Total	1,345

The building alterations approved by the Council are well on their way to completion. The rooms on the second floor have been refurbished and the Oliver Room completed. For making the Oliver Room possible, we are deeply indebted to Mrs. Peter Oliver, Andrew Oliver, members of the Oliver family, and their friends. We hope that the membership will come to the exhibition and party formally opening the Oliver Room on October 27. A new stack has been completed in the basement to house the special libraries removed from the room to the left of the lobby on the first floor. This latter room, the final step in our current alterations plan, will contain the Henry Adams library and the Society's collection of maps and atlases. The room is ready, the plans drawn; all that is needed is the money, part of which we have. Thus far the Members and friends of the Society have been very generous in their help. It is only fair to add that they have received good value for their money. This is largely due to the hard work and generosity of many people, particularly Thomas B. Adams, James Lawrence, Jr., and Edward P. Hamilton.

On the social side the Society has had a busy year, and the end is not yet in sight. Forty-nine persons attended the Annual Dinner and heard Frederick Merk, the Guest of Honor, speak on "Safety Valve Thesis: 1844." On an average, 37 persons attended the monthly meetings, while 300 came to our Spring Reception, which was devoted to an exhibition of the work of Paul Revere. On September 22 the Society and Harvard University Press celebrated the publication of the first four volumes of The Adams Papers—the *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*—so beautifully edited by Lyman H. Butterfield and his staff. John Adams certainly would have described this occasion as "an epocha, a decisive event." After a luncheon to visiting scholars at the Tavern Club, the dedicatory exercises were held at the Society, with Samuel Flagg Bemis giving the main address. A reception for over 400 persons concluded the festivities of the afternoon. In the evening Harvard University Press gave a splendid dinner at the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. It was indeed a memorable day.

To the long roll of deceased Members we must add five names: Theodore Clarke Smith, elected a Resident Member on March 9, 1905, died in North Adams on November 19, 1960; Mark Antony DeWolfe Howe, elected a Resident Member on November 8, 1906, and an Honorary Member on May 12, 1955, died in Cambridge on

December 6, 1960; Gilbert Holland Montague, elected a Corresponding Member on March 14, 1946, died in New York, New York, on February 4, 1961; Lawrence Waters Jenkins, elected a Resident Member on December 13, 1934, died in Danvers on April 20, 1961; and Sir Charles Kingsley Webster, elected a Corresponding Member on February 9, 1933, died in London, England, on August 21, 1961.

Eleven Resident Members, eleven Corresponding Members, two Associate Members, and one Honorary Member have been elected since the last Annual Meeting in the following order: Resident—Douglas Wallace Bryant, Kenneth Schuyler Lynn, Franklin Lewis Ford, Stephen Phillips, Philip Hofer, Henry Donaldson Jordan, C. Rodgers Burgin, John Daniel Cushing, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, William Lincoln Payson, and James Jackson Minot; Corresponding—David Herbert Donald, Nicholas Biddle Wainwright, Sir Frank Chalton Francis, Milton Halsey Thomas, Marcus Falkner Cunliffe, Barnaby Conrad Keeney, Jacques Barzun, Sir Isaiah Berlin, John Melville Jennings, Comer Vann Woodward, and Robert Roswell Palmer; Associate—Harold Bowditch and William Goodwin Renwick; and Honorary—Waldo Gifford Leland. Including the Members elected today, we now have 10 Honorary Members, 5 Associate Members, 73 Corresponding Members, and 144 Resident Members.

There have been two changes in the Society's Staff. Our secretary, Mrs. Jerome E. Weinstein, resigned last spring and was succeeded by Miss Margaret G. Berner. The work of cataloguing the Winthrop Papers is now in the hands of Mrs. Alden Bradford Christie. In closing this report, I should like to thank the Staff for its willingness to perform all kinds of unusual tasks in addition to its regular work. Such willingness has enabled us to accomplish many things of which we are justly proud.

Mr. Freiberg then read the

REPORT OF THE EDITOR

DURING the past year the Society has published the following titles: the microfilm edition of The Papers of Henry Knox; *M.H.S. Miscellany* No. 6; *Paul Revere's Three Accounts of his Famous Ride* (being our 1961 Picture Book and bearing the splendid Introduction of our Corresponding Member, Edmund S. Morgan); and

Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, XXXIV, Part 1 (1757).

In addition, there appeared on September 22 the *Diary and Autobiography of John Adams*, being the first four volumes in the Society-sponsored edition of the letterpress edition of The Adams Papers, published by The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. Press-work will soon begin on the second edition, revised and enlarged, of our 1960 Picture Book on *Thomas Jefferson's Architectural Drawings*. When completed, it will bear the triple imprint of the Massachusetts Historical Society, the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, and University of Virginia Press. *Sibley's Harvard Graduates*, XII, covering the classes of 1746–1750, is already in the galley proof stage and is thus far advanced.

Since much of the Society's editorial work is like an iceberg and of a sort whose major outlines are not readily perceived, I call your attention to what is below the surface and being worked on: *Collections*, LXXX and LXXXI; next year's *House Journals; M.H.S. Miscellany* Nos. 7 and 8; *Proceedings*, LXXIII; and *Winthrop Papers*, VI.

Alfred A. Knopf then read a paper entitled "Random Recollections of a Publisher."[13]

The Annual Meeting then adjourned at 4:45 P.M., to reconvene at the Club of Odd Volumes, 77 Mount Vernon Street, at 6:30 P.M. for the Society's Annual Dinner, at which Henry Lee Shattuck gave an address entitled "Some Experiences of My Political Life."[14]

November Meeting, 1961

THE Society met in the Dowse Library on Thursday, November 9, 1961, at three o'clock in the afternoon, President Adams in the chair.

The record of the stated and Annual Meeting of October 19 was read and approved.

The Treasurer reported that since the last meeting the Building Fund had increased from $4,100 to $4,829; and that the Endow-

[13] Printed in this volume, pp. 92–103.

[14] Printed in this volume, pp. 81–91.

ment Fund stood unchanged at $108,511 and the Library Fund at $12,133.

The Corresponding Secretary reported the receipt of acceptances of election to Associate Membership from Harold Bowditch, of Peterborough, New Hampshire, and William Goodwin Renwick, of Tucson, Arizona; to Corresponding Membership from Robert Roswell Palmer, of Princeton, New Jersey, and Comer Vann Woodward, of New Haven, Connecticut; to Honorary Membership from Waldo Gifford Leland, of Washington, D. C.; and to Resident Membership from John Daniel Cushing, of Hingham, James Jackson Minot, of Beverly, and William Lincoln Payson, of Cambridge.

The President announced the appointment of the following Standing Committees for 1961–1962:

Finance: John Bryant Paine, Jr., *Chairman*; Thomas Boylston Adams, William Henry Claflin, and Henry Lee Shattuck.

House: Edward Pierce Hamilton, *Chairman*; James Lawrence, Jr., Bertram Kimball Little, and Carleton Rubira Richmond.

Library: Lyman Henry Butterfield, *Chairman*; Keyes DeWitt Metcalf, Robert Earle Moody, Henry Latimer Seaver, and Clifford Kenyon Shipton.

Meetings: William Alexander Jackson, *Chairman*; Thomas Boylston Adams, and Stephen Thomas Riley.

Membership: Thomas Boylston Adams, *Chairman*; James Barr Ames, Paul Herman Buck, Edward Pierce Hamilton, Stephen Thomas Riley, Walter Muir Whitehill, and Thomas James Wilson.

Publication: Robert Earle Moody, *Chairman*; Lyman Henry Butterfield, Malcolm Freiberg, Stephen Thomas Riley, Clifford Kenyon Shipton, and Walter Muir Whitehill.

Resources: Howland Shaw Warren, *Chairman.*

The Director reported the following accessions for October:

From Charles Batchelder, of Milton, a pencil sketch of the United States Army Hospital at Gallipolis, Ohio, during the Civil War.

From John M. Gourgas, of Weston, a collection of papers of the Gourgas family, 1614–1842.

From Mrs. L. F. Jacquith, of Woburn, a collection of Civil War letters of George Edward Fowle, 39th Massachusetts Volunteers, to Miss Eliza Caldwell, of Woburn, later his wife, 1862–1865.

From Mrs. Harold Kellock, of Washington, D. C., a letter from Abigail Adams, 2nd, to John Thaxter, dated at Braintree, May 25, 1781, a letter from Thomas Boylston Adams to Orchard Cook, dated at Quincy, November 14, 1811, and a document relating to a deficiency fund, dated at Whitehall, January 4, 1783, and signed by Lord Shelbourne, William Pitt, and R. Jackson.

From Henry Cabot Lodge, a packet of miscellaneous letters and books to be added to the papers of Henry Cabot Lodge (1850–1924) now on deposit in the Society.

From Richard A. Newhall, of Williamstown, a collection of letters written by Edith Abell to her family while in Italy studying music, 1870–1872.

From Andrew Oliver, sections of the diary of William Pynchon (1723–1789) to be added to other sections given earlier by Edward P. Oliver.

From Dwight L. Smith, of Oxford, Ohio, a document relating to the sale of part of Union Wharf, May 15, 1817, and a letter written by Joseph May to Mrs. John Hancock, dated at Boston, January 14, 1796.

From the late B. Sumner Welles, of Bernardsville, New Jersey, a small collection of letters relating to the Welles family, 1804–1888.

From Miss Mary E. Williams, of Boston, a collection of material on the '88 Sewing Circle and on her grandfather, Moses Williams.

By purchase: a volume of printed and manuscript material relating to the death of George Washington, collected and copied by Thomas Pemberton; a rare pamphlet on the Boston Tea Party by Israel Holly, *God Brings About His Holy and Wise Purpose.* . . . (Hartford, 1774); a collection of deeds, etc., relating to the Burroughs family; a very fine letter written by John Higginson to the General Court of Massachusetts, June 6, 1663, about his Election Sermon (the first in this country that exists in printed form; the Society owns a copy of it); and a letter book kept by the Corresponding Secretary of the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society, April 9, 1834–January 7, 1838.

The Director reported the following accessions for November:

From Columbia University Press, the first two volumes of the new edition of *The Papers of Alexander Hamilton.*

From Mrs. Stephen S. Fitzgerald, of Weston, the diaries of her father, Francis Blake, the inventor of the Blake transmitter, 1866–1913, and the records of the '95 Sewing Circle.

From Dr. Margaret Noyes Kleinert, of Boston, a collection of Civil War letters written by Edward J. Noyes, of Lowell, to his parents, December 1, 1861–May 1, 1864. Noyes served as a lieutenant in Company "C," 3rd Massachusetts Cavalry, transferring later to the 1st Texas Cavalry, where he rose to the rank of major.

From the Estate of Miss Edith R. Leonard, of Plainfield, New Jersey, a number of documents relating to the Leonard family of Taunton, 1699–1758.

From William Stanley Parker, of Boston, the correspondence of James Sav-

age (1784–1873) with Mrs. Mary Lincoln, and other materials on the Otis family, 1770–1940.

From Mrs. George I. Rockwood, of Worcester, a contemporary copy of a letter from Peter Thacher to the East Parish of Attleboro, September 23, 1748, accepting a call.

From the Estate of Waldo C. Sprague, a small collection of printed material and transcripts of original manuscripts relating to missionary work in the Sandwich Islands, 1819–1823.

From Nathaniel Winthrop, of New York, New York, a power of administration to Aaron Pratt, of Cohasset, issued by Judge Cushing at Dedham, April 1, 1776.

Oscar Handlin then presented a paper entitled "James Burgh and American Revolutionary Theory."[15]

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

December Meeting, 1961

THE Society met in the Dowse Library on Thursday, December 14, 1961, at three o'clock in the afternoon, President Adams in the chair.

The record of the stated meeting of November 9, read by the Cabinet-Keeper in the absence of the Recording Secretary, was approved.

The Treasurer reported that the Building Fund had reached $10,771 and that the Endowment Fund had reached $113,311. Noting the level of the Building Fund, President Adams reported that the Council had authorized further changes to the building to proceed forthwith, in the confidence that additional funds to complete them would be forthcoming.

At the request of the President, Mr. Shipton then reported on a recent vote of the Committee of Publication that would alter the format and contents of the Society's *Proceedings* series from a hard-bound volume covering three or four years to a paper-covered annual covering one calendar year, the last hard-bound volume to be Volume 72 (October, 1957–December, 1960) and the first paper-covered annual to be Volume 73 (January–December, 1961), but with cloth

[15] Printed in this volume, pp. 38–57.

bindings uniform with earlier bound volumes to be made available at cost to those wanting them.

The Director reported the following accessions:

From Frederick Foster, of Boston, a number of deeds relating to the sale of land on the Kennebec River between William Baker, of Bayfordburn, England, Robert Gould Shaw, of Boston, and James Bridge and Revel Williams, of Augusta, 1807; also a deed of sale of land by Moses Noyes, of Lyme, Connecticut, to his son, October 21, 1778.

From the late B. Sumner Welles, of Bernardsville, New Jersey, a number of invitations extended to Governor and Mrs. Increase Sumner by John Hancock and James Swan, 1783–1797; also a letter from Sumner to his wife dated at Northampton, April 8, 1787, about the trials of persons arrested for participation in Shays's Rebellion.

By purchase: a small collection of whaling logs, 1754–1822, kept by Zephaniah, Christopher, and Nathaniel Pinkham and B. C. Chase, of Nantucket. The logs contain poetry, a plan of an ice field, accounts, etc. There is also a ciphering book kept by Christopher Pinkham in 1711.

Mr. Frank Burt Freidel, Jr., then read a paper entitled "Roosevelt, Hoover, Stimson, and Interregnum Foreign Policy, November, 1932–March, 1933,"[16] after which he answered a number of questions from the floor.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 P.M.

[16] To appear in a future volume of *Franklin D. Roosevelt.*

Index

Index

ABBDY, Matthew, prototype of "Father Abbey," 18.
Abell, Edith, letters, 162.
Abell family, letters to, 162.
Acorn-and-oak leaf, *Adams Papers* device, 122–123.
Adams, Abigail, letter, 162.
Adams, Abigail Smith (Mrs. J.), 156; Quincy Stone Church memorial plaque, MS of suggested text, 116; letter to, facsimile, 120.
Adams, Brooks, 156.
Adams, Catherine, 156.
Adams, Charles Francis (1807–1886), 156; as editor, 137–139, 147–148; quoted, 139; Diary, ed. D. H. and A. DiP. Donald, 140; M. Duberman biography, 149.
Adams, Charles Francis (1835–1915), 156; letters, 115; and W. C. Ford, 139; career, 141; *Three Episodes of Massachusetts History*, 141.
Adams, Charles Francis (1866–1954), trustee, 142, 144.
Adams family, 123.
"The Adams Family and their Manuscripts," by S. F. Bemis, 134–149.
Adams, George Washington, 149.
Adams, Henry (1838–1918), 156; library, 152, 158, additions, 119.
Adams, Henry (1875–1951), 134; trustee, S. F. Bemis on, 142–145.
Adams, John (1735–1826), 156; letters, 113; letter, facsimile, 120; Quincy Stone Church memorial plaque, MS of suggested text, 116; *Diary and Autobiography*, M.H.S. ceremony, 119–150; on hurricane, 121; quoted, 132, 135–136; *Works*, ed. C. F. Adams, 137; C. D. Bowen study, 142; and *Adams Papers*, 146–147; *Diary and Autobiography*, 158, 160.
Adams, John (1875–), luncheon guest, 120.
Adams, John Quincy (1767–1848), 134, 156; alterations, 116; tree-planter, 122–123; quoted, 123, 138; and Adams MSS, 137; *Memoirs*, ed. C. F. Adams, 137–139; Diary, 137–139; *Writings*, ed. W. C. Ford, 139–140; and A. Royall, 142, 149–150; and *Adams Papers*, 148–149.
Adams, John Quincy (1922–), trustee, and Adams MSS, 145.
Adams, Louisa Johnson (Mrs. J. Q.), 156.
Adams Manuscript Trust, 125; and Adams MSS, 142; trustees, 142–146.
Adams Manuscripts, 135; trustees' condition of gift, 122; history in, 136; and J. Q. Adams, 137; placed in M.H.S., 141–142; and Adams Manuscript Trust, 142; given to M.H.S., 146–147.
Adams Memorial Society, funds to M.H.S., 117.
Adams Papers, microfilm edition, 145; staff, 156.
The Adams Papers, 125, 130, 160; M.H.S. ceremony, 119–150, 158, speakers, 119–120, keepsake, 120, addresses and remarks, 120–150; acorn-and-oak leaf device, 122–123; motto, 123; and *Life*, 124, 146; publishing norms, 124; ed. L. H. Butterfield, J. P. Boyd on, 131–133; publication, 145–147, explosion, 145–146; and J. Adams, 147–148; and J. Q. Adams, 148–149.
Adams Room, work authorized, 119.
Adams, Samuel (1722–1803), 156.
Adams, Samuel, letter, 119.
Adams, Sherman, gift, 119.
Adams, Thomas Boylston (1772–1832), letter, 162.
Adams, Thomas Boylston (1910–), 113, 114, 117, 118, 122, 150, 160, 163; thanks to, 113, 152; sponsor, 115, 119; absent, 116; report, 117, 118–119, 163; announces Commit-

tees, 119, 161; gift, 119; *Adams Papers* luncheon, 120, address, 120–122; on material of history, 121–122; lauds elusive S. T. Riley, 123–124; on T. J. Wilson, 124; on P. H. Buck, 124–125; on J. P. Boyd, 130; on S. F. Bemis, 133–134, 149–150; trustee, and Adams MSS, 145; on family swimming habits, 149–150; on diary vs. dueling, 150; speaker, 150; President, 151; committees, Finance, 153, 161, Meetings, 161, Membership, chairman, 161; aid, 158.
Allis, Frederick Scouller, Jr., Council, 151.
America, modern, vs. ancient Rome, M. Hammond on, 3–17.
American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University Press dinner, 150, 158.
American Antiquarian Society, gift, 115, 119.
American art, pictorial history, 118.
American Civil War, and 1861 Peace Convention, 58–80; efforts to prevent, 58; and Negro slavery, S. E. Morison on, 69–70.
American economic thought, history, 156.
American-French relations, 19th century, 156.
American Philosophical Society, and *Franklin Papers*, 146.
American Revolution, journal, 116.
American revolutionary theory, and J. Burgh, Handlins on, 38–57.
Ames, Fisher, 156.
Ames, James Barr, report, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 161; Corresponding Secretary, 151; Membership Committee, 161.
Analogies, past vs. present, M. Hammond on, 6–16.
"Ancient Rome and Modern America Reconsidered," by M. Hammond, 3–17, 118.
Andrew, Gov. John A., letter, 115.
Anti-Slavery Society, Boston Female, letterbook, 162.
Art, American, pictorial history, 118.
Artists, and Sacco-Vanzetti Case, 156.
Attleboro East Parish, letter to, copy, 163.
Author, *Father Abbey's Will*, 24.

BAILYN, Bernard, "Political Experience and Enlightenment Ideas in Eighteenth-Century America," 114; promotion, 114; Council, 151.
Baker, William, deed, 164.
Bank of North America, 156.
Barzun, Jacques, Corresponding Member, 116, 117, 159.
Batchelder, Charles, gift, 161.
Beard, Charles A., quoted, 92–93.
Belcher, Gov. Jonathan, 24–26; quoted, 26.
Belcher, Jonathan, Jr., 25.
Belknap, Abigail, sampler, 116.
Belknap Press, Harvard University Press, 119, 123, 124, 146, 150, 160.
Bell, Whitfield Jenks, Jr., luncheon guest, 120.
Bemis, Samuel Flagg, speaker, 120, 158; "The Adams Family and their Manuscripts," 134–149.
Berlin, Sir Isaiah, Corresponding Member, 116, 117, 159.
Bernard, Gov. Francis, 156.
Berner, Margaret G., M.H.S. secretary, 159.
Bibliography, *Father Abbey's Will*, by G. T. Goodspeed, 30–37.
Biography, American, books on, 115, 118, 157.
Blake, Francis, diaries, 162.
Blake transmitter, inventor, diaries, 162.
Bonner, Capt. John, Boston map, 25.
Bookbindings, early American, 156.
Boston, Bonner map, 25; "prospect," 25; politics, and H. L. Shattuck, 81–91; reception of Marquand novel, 89; harbor, defense, 113, islands, 115; Mayor, letter to, 115; Burgis-Price view, repairs, 116–117; and Mexican War, 156.
Boston Chess Club, banquet speeches, MS, 113.

Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society, letterbook, 162.
Boston Police Strike, 156.
Boston Tea Party, 156; pamphlet, 162.
Boutwell, George S., quoted, 70.
Bowen, Catherine Drinker, *John Adams and the American Revolution*, 142.
Bowditch, Harold, Associate Member, 151, 159, 161.
Bowdoin, James (1752–1811), account book, 114; letterbook, 114.
Boyd, Julian Parks, speaker, 120; ed. *Jefferson Papers*, 130, 145; remarks, 131–133; on L. H. Butterfield, 131–133.
Bradlee, Frederick Josiah, sponsor, 151.
Bradstreet, Simon, 156.
Brewing, colonial, 156.
Bridge, James, deed, 164.
Bridges, and H. L. Shattuck, 83–85.
Briggs, Dr. Charles E., Civil War letters, 116.
Briggs, Walter D., gift, 116.
Brinton, Crane, sponsor, 151.
British Empire, history, 156.
Brown, Bacall & Company, auditors, 153.
Bryant, Douglas Wallace, Resident Member, 113, 159.
Buck, Paul Herman, sponsor, 115; speaker, 120; remarks, 125–130; on Harvard presidents, 125–126; on Harvard professors, 127; Membership Committee, 161.
Burgh, James, and American revolutionary theory, Handlins on, 38–57; reputation, 38–39; writings, 39–40, popularity, 51–54; teacher, 40–41; at Newington Green, 40–41; acquaintances, 41–43; and moral issues, 43–46; political ideas, 46–50, divergences from, 54–55, significance, 55–57; on American colonies, 50–51.
Burgin, C. Rodgers, Resident Member, 117, 118, 159.
Burgis, William, *A Prospect of the Colledges . . .*, 25.
Burgis-Price view, Boston, repairs, 116–117.
Burroughs family, deeds, 162.
Butterfield, Lyman Henry, 121, 122, 132–133, 158; sponsor, 117; committees, Nominating, 119, Library, chairman, 161, Publication, 161; speaker, 119; remarks, 122–123; J. P. Boyd on, 131–133.

CAECILIUS Statius, source, *Adams Papers* device motto, 123.
Caldwell, Miss Eliza (Mrs. G. E. Fowle), letters to, 161.
Carey, Mathew, 156.
Cather, Willa, A. A. Knopf on, 99–100.
Charles Francis Adams, by M. Duberman, 149.
Charles Sumner and the Coming of the Civil War, by D. H. Donald, 149.
Chase, B. C., whaling log, 164.
Chiropractors, and H. L. Shattuck, 86–87.
Christie, Jane T. (Mrs. Alden Bradford), Winthrop Papers cataloguer, 159.
Cicero, Marcus Tullius, First Tusculan Disputation, 123.
Ciphering book, 164.
Civil War, and 1861 Peace Convention, 58–80; efforts to prevent, 58; and Negro slavery, S. E. Morison on, 69–70; letters, 116, 161, 162; U. S. Army Hospital, pencil sketch, 161.
Claflin, William Henry, Finance Committee, 153, 161.
Collections of the M.H.S. See M.H.S., publications, *Collections*.
Columbia University Press, gift, 162.
Continental Congress, Boston Deputy Paymaster, records, 117.
The Converted Sinner, by [C. Mather], 119.
Cook, Orchard, letter to, 162.
Cooke, Alistair, ed. *The Vintage Mencken*, 102.
Coolidge, Gov. Calvin, and 1920 Mass. budget, 83.
A Correspondence with the Harvard University Press, by A. W. Ryder, 126.
Crittenden Compromise, and Civil War, 58.

The Crow's Nest, by C. Day, 96.
Cunliffe, Marcus Falkner, Corresponding Member, 115, 116, 159.
Curley, Mayor James M., and Larz Anderson Bridge, 84–85; political deviousness of, 90–91.
Currency, paper, 116.
Cushing, Judge ———, power of administration, 162.
Cushing, John Daniel, Resident Member, 119, 159, 161; Assistant Librarian, 157.

DAY, Clarence, A. A. Knopf on, 95–98.
Death Comes for the Archbishop, by W. Cather, 101.
Death in Venice, by T. Mann, 94–95.
Defense, Boston harbor, 113.
Deficiency fund, document, 162.
Delegates, 1861 Peace Convention, 61–64.
Denison, G., letter to, 115.
Device, *Adams Papers* acorn-and-oak leaf, 122–123.
Diary and Autobiography of John Adams, 158, 160; M.H.S. ceremony, 119–150.
Differences and similarities, past vs. present, M. Hammond on, 3–17.
Dodge, Ernest S., L. W. Jenkins memoir, 107–109.
Dodge, William E., quoted, 73.
Donald, Aïda DiPace, ed. C. F. Adams Diary, 140.
Donald, David Herbert, Corresponding Member, 113, 159; ed. C. F. Adams Diary, 140; *Charles Sumner* . . . , 149.
Douglass, William, 156.
Drake, ———, letter to, 115.
Duberman, Martin, *Charles Francis Adams*, 149.
Dumas, C. W. F., letter to, 113.

EATON, Vincent L., gift, 113.
East Boston, first house, engraving, 118; plans, 118.
East Parish of Attleboro, letter to, copy, 163.
Educational television, and H. L. Shattuck, 89–90.
Edwards, Jonathan, *A Faithful Narrative* . . . , 2nd edn., 116.
'88 Sewing Circle, material on, 162.
Election Sermon, first printed, 162.

FAITHFUL *Narrative of the Surprizing Work of God* . . . , 2nd edn., by J. Edwards, 116.
"Father Abbey," M. Abdy prototype of, 18.
Father Abbey's Will, author, 18; text quoted, 19–22; later printings, 26–30; textual variations, 27; bibliography, by G. T. Goodspeed, 30–37.
"*Father Abbey's Will*," by G. T. Goodspeed, 18–37, 117.
Federalist Party, Mass., 156.
Field, David Dudley, quoted, 72–73.
Fitzgerald, Mrs. Stephen S., gift, 162.
Five moments, in Roman history, M. Hammond on, 6–16.
Ford, Franklin Lewis, Resident Member, 115, 116, 159.
Ford, Worthington Chauncey, and M.H.S., 139; ed. J. Q. Adams *Writings*, 139–140.
Foster, Frederick, gift, 164.
Foster, Mrs. Reginald, gift and deposit, 113.
Fowle, George Edward, letters, 161.
Fowle, Mrs. George Edward. *See* Miss Eliza Caldwell.
Francis, Sir Frank Chalton, Corresponding Member, 113, 114, 159.
Franco-American relations, 19th century, 156.
Franklin Papers, 146.
Freiberg, Malcolm, 157; sponsor, 115; Editor's report, 159–160; Publication Committee, 161.
Freidel, Frank Burt, Jr., "Roosevelt, Hoover, Stimson, and Interregnum Foreign Policy, November, 1932–March, 1933," 164.

Freÿenhagen, Wilhelm, Revolutionary War journal, 116.
Friedman, Lee Max, bequest, 153.
Fuller, Gov. Alvan T., and mental hospitals, 87–88; and Sen. W. E. McLane, 88.

GALLIPOLIS, Ohio, U. S. Army Civil War Hospital, pencil sketch, 161.
Gardens, 17th century, 156.
Gazette de France, 118.
Gerry, Elbridge, 156; letters to, 113.
Gettysburg Campaign, 156.
Gibran, Kalil, A. A. Knopf on, 100–101.
Gilmore, Myron Piper, sponsor, 113.
God Brings About His Holy and Wise Purpose . . ., by I. Holly, 162.
Godkin, Edwin Lawrence, 156.
Goodspeed, George Talbot, "*Father Abbey's Will*," 18–37, 117, bibliography, 30–37.
Goodspeed's Book Shop, gift, 117.
Gourgas family, papers, 161.
Gourgas, John M., gift, 161.
Great Awakening, 156.
Green Mansions, by W. H. Hudson, 93.
Greene, Nathanael, 156.
Grey of Fallodon, Viscount Edward, on W. H. Hudson, 93.
Grover, Wayne Clayton, luncheon guest, 120.

HALL, G. Stanley, quoted, 18.
Hamer, Philip May, luncheon guest, 120.
Hamilton, Alexander, *Papers*, 162.
Hamilton, Edward Pierce, reads minutes, 116, 117, 163; sponsor, 117; Cabinet-Keeper, 151; committees, Nominating, 119, report, 151, House, chairman, 161, Membership, 161; thanks to, 152; aid, 158.
Hammond, Mason, "Ancient Rome and Modern America Reconsidered," 3–17, 118; sponsor, 116.
Hancock, John, invitations, 164.
Hancock, Mrs. John, letter to, 162.
Handlin, Mary, "James Burgh and American Revolutionary Theory," 38–57.
Handlin, Oscar, "James Burgh and American Revolutionary Theory," 38–57, 163; sponsor, 119.
Harding, Warren G., 156.
Harvard College, W. Burgis view, 25.
Harvard Bridge. *See* Larz Anderson Bridge.
Harvard University, presidents, P. H. Buck on, 125–126; professors, P. H. Buck on, 127.
Harvard University Press, 125, 136; Belknap Press, 123, 124, 146, 160, *Adams Papers* publisher, 119, 122, 158; founding, 127; housing, 128; nomenclature, 128; precarious existence, 128; objects, 129; 1945 decision, 129; justification, 130; American Academy dinner, 150, 158.
Haynes, Guy C., house, engraving, 118.
Henry Adams library, 158, additions, 119.
Hergesheimer, Joseph, A. A. Knopf on, 98–99.
Higginson, John, letter, 156–157, 162.
Histories, pictorial, 118.
History, Roman, five moments in, M. Hammond on, 6–16; American, books on, 115, 118, 157; in Adams MSS, 136.
H. M. Pulham, Esquire, by J. P. Marquand, MS of, 89.
Hoar, George Frisbie, 156; papers, 113, 156.
Hoar, Rockwood, papers, 113.
Hofer, Philip, Resident Member, 116, 117, 159.
Holly, Israel, *God Brings About His . . . Purpose . . .*, 162.
Hospitals, mental, Mass., 87–88; U. S. Army, Civil War, pencil sketch, 161.
Howe, Mark Antony DeWolfe, death, 158–159.
Hudson, W. H., Gray of Fallodon on, 93.

INDIA, trade, 156.
Insurance, marine, 156.

Insurance lobby, and H. L. Shattuck, 85–86.
Islands, Boston harbor, 115.

JACKSON, Andrew, J. Q. Adams on, 122–123.
Jackson, R., signature, 162.
Jackson, William Alexander, sponsor, 116; Meetings Committee, chairman, 161.
"James Burgh and American Revolutionary Theory," by O. and M. Handlin, 38–57, 163.
Jacquith, Mrs. L. F., gift, 161.
Jarvis, Miss Delia (Mrs. W. Tudor), correspondence, 115.
Jefferson, Thomas, 156; quoted, 133; *Papers*, ed. J. P. Boyd, 145; *Architectural Drawings*, 160; Memorial Foundation, 160.
Jenkins, Lawrence Waters, E. S. Dodge memoir, 107–109; and Peabody Museum, 107–109; later career, 107–109; education, 107; *Wrecked Among Cannibals in the Fijis*, 108; military career, 108; memberships, 108–109; death, 118, 159.
Jennings, John Melville, Corresponding Member, 117, 118, 159.
Jensen, Merrill, 137.
John Adams and the American Revolution, by C. D. Bowen, 142.
Jordan, Henry Donaldson, Resident Member, 116, 117, 159.
Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts. *See* M.H.S., publications, *House Journals*.

KEENEY, Barnaby Conrad, Corresponding Member, 115, 116, 159.
Kellock, Mrs. Harold, gift, 162.
Kennebec River, land sales, deeds, 164.
Kennedy, President John Fitzgerald, 134–135; Resident Member, 119, 159.
King Philip's War, in Me., 156.
Kittredge, George Lyman, quoted, 127.
Kleinert, Dr. Margaret Noyes, gift, 162.
Klingelhofer, Dr. Herbert E., gift, 116.
Knopf, Alfred A., "Random Recollections of a Publisher," 92–103, 160; C. A. Beard advises, 92–93; early publishing success, 93; on T. Mann, 94–95; on C. Day, 95–98; on J. Hergesheimer, 98–99; on W. Cather, 99–100; on K. Gibran, 100–101; on H. L. Mencken, 101–103; gift, 118, 157; luncheon guest, 120.
Knopf, Blanche, 94, 103.
Knox, Henry, Papers. *See* M.H.S., publications, Knox Papers.
Kurtz, Stephen G., 137.

LABAREE, Leonard Woods, luncheon guest, 120; ed. *Franklin Papers*, 146.
LaFarge, Dr. C. Grant, gift and deposit, 113.
LaFarge, W. E. R., gift and deposit, 113.
Larsen, Roy Edward, *Life* magazine and *Adams Papers*, 124.
Larz Anderson Bridge (Harvard Bridge), and H. L. Shattuck, 84–85.
Laughlin, Henry Alexander, gift, 157.
Lawrence, James, Jr., thanks to, 152; aid, 158; House Committee, 161.
League of Nations, 156.
Leland, Waldo Gifford, Honorary Member, 151, 159, 161.
Leonard, Miss Edith R., Estate of, gift, 162.
Leonard family, documents, 162.
Life magazine, *Adams Papers*, 146, editorial funds, 122, and R. E. Larsen, 124; *Franklin Papers*, 146.
Life with Father, by C. Day, 95, 97–98.
Lincoln, Benjamin, letter to, 115.
Lincoln, Mrs. Mary, letters to, 114; correspondence with, 162–163.
Little, Bertram Kimball, House Committee, 161.
Lobby, insurance, and H. L. Shattuck, 85–86.
Lodge, Henry Cabot (1850–1924), papers, addition, 162.
Lodge, Henry Cabot (1902–), gift, 162.

Lomasney, Martin, B. L. Young on, 115.
A Lost Lady, by W. Cather, 100.
Lyman, Mrs. Harrison F., gift, 118.
Lowell, A. Lawrence, quoted, 129.
Lynn, Kenneth Schuyler, Resident Member, 113, 159.

McLANE, Sen. Walter E., H. L. Shattuck on, 88.
Madison, James, letters to, 113.
The Madman, by K. Gibran, 100.
Mann, Thomas, A. A. Knopf on, 94–95.
Marine insurance, 156.
Marquand, John P., and *H. M. Pulham, Esquire*, MS, 89.
"Martin Lomasney as I Knew Him," by B. L. Young, 115.
Massachusetts, politics, and H. L. Shattuck, 81–91; Federalist Party, 156; 19th century, treatment of insane, 156; General Court, letter to, 156–157, 162; *House Journals*. *See* M.H.S., publications, *House Journals*.
Massachusetts Archives, 132.
Massachusetts Historical Society, 123, 136, 146; thanks Pres. T. B. Adams, 113; Funds, Building, 113, 116, 118, 152, 155, 160, 163, Endowment, 113, 116, 117, 118, 153, 160–161, 163, Library, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 153, 157, 161, M.H.S. Trust, 118, Norcross, I, 152, 155, P. Oliver, 152, Paine Publication, 153, Saltonstall, 153, Adams Papers Editorial, 155, Adams Papers Microfilm, 155, Sibley, 155; reports, accessions, 113–114, 115, 116, 117–118, 119, 161–163, 164, Corresponding Secretary, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 161, Treasurer, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 152–155, 160–161, 163, Nominating Committee, 151, Council, 155–159, Editor, 159–160, President, 163, Publication Committee, 163–164; Adams Memorial Society funds, 117; building changes, 117, 118–119, 152, 154, 158, 163; *Adams Papers* ceremony, 119–150, 158, speakers, 119–120, keepsake, 120, addresses and remarks, 120–150, Tavern Club luncheon, 158; committees, Nominating, 119, report, 151, Finance, 153, 161, House, 161, Library, 161, Meetings, 161, Membership, 161, Publication, 161, Resources, 161; publications, 121, 159–160, Saltonstall Papers, 153, *House Journals*, 154–155, 160, *Picture Books*, 155, 159, 160, *Sibley's Harvard Graduates*, 155, 160, C. Remick "Perspective View . . . ," 157, Knox Papers, microfilm edition, 159, *M.H.S. Miscellany*, 159, 160, *Collections*, 160, *Proceedings*, 160, changes, 163–164, *Winthrop Papers*, 160; justification, 130; Adams MSS placed in, 141–142, gift of, 146–147; elections, officers, 151–152, Members, 159; H. Adams library, 152, 158; map room, 152, 158; Oliver Room, 152, exhibition and reception, 158; reading room, 152, 155–156; investments, 153–154; expenses, 154–155; operating deficit, 155; readers, 156; staff, 156, changes, 159; library, 157; meetings, attendance, 158; Spring Reception, 158; stack room, 158; Members, deaths, 158–159, totals, 159; Annual Dinner, 160; imprint, 160; Adams Editor. *See* Lyman Henry Butterfield; Assistant Librarian. *See* John Daniel Cushing; Cabinet-Keeper. *See* Edward Pierce Hamilton; Corresponding Secretary. *See* James Barr Ames; Director and Librarian. *See* Stephen Thomas Riley; Editor of Publications. *See* Malcolm Freiberg; President. *See* Thomas Boylston Adams; Recording Secretary. *See* Walter Muir Whitehill; Saltonstall Editor. *See* Robert Earle Moody; secretaries. *See* Charlotte B. Weinstein and Margaret G. Berner; Sibley Editor. *See* Clifford Kenyon Shipton; Treasurer. *See* John Bryant Paine, Jr.; Vice-

Presidents. *See* Henry Latimer Seaver and Stephen Wheatland; Winthrop Papers cataloguer. *See* Jane T. Christie.
M.H.S. Miscellany. *See* M.H.S., publications, *M.H.S. Miscellany*.
M.H.S. Picture Books. *See* M.H.S., publications, *Picture Books*.
[Mather, Cotton], *The Converted Sinner*, 119.
Matthews, Albert, letters, 115.
May, Joseph, letter, 162.
Mayor, Boston, letter to, 115.
Memoirs of John Quincy Adams . . ., ed. C. F. Adams, 137–139.
Mencken, Henry L., A. A. Knopf on, 101–103.
Mental hospitals, Mass., 87–88.
Meriden Gravure Company, 120, 157.
Merk, Frederick, "Safety Valve Thesis: 1844," 158.
Metcalf, Keyes DeWitt, sponsor, 151; Library Committee, 161.
Mexican War, and Boston, 156.
Minot, James Jackson, Resident Member, 151, 159, 161.
Missionaries, Sandwich Islands, collection on, 163.
Montague, Gilbert Holland, death, 115, 159.
Moody, Robert Earle, sponsor, 116; Saltonstall Editor, 117, 157; committees, Library, 161, Publication, chairman, 161.
Morgan, Edmund Sears, Introduction, *M.H.S. Picture Book*, 159.
Morison, Samuel Eliot, "The Peace Convention of February, 1861," 58–80, 119; on slavery and Civil War, 69–70.
Morphy, Paul, banquet honoring, 113.
Morton, Thomas, of Merrymount, 156.
Moswetuset Hummock, Quincy Bay, transfer, 117.
Motto, *Adams Papers* device, 123.
Murray, Councilman Peter A., H. L. Shattuck and traffic lights, 89.
Murdock, Harold, quoted, 128–129.
My Antonia, by W. Cather, 99.

NATIONAL Historical Publications Commission, 132; and Pres. H. S. Truman, 145.
Navy, U. S., in East, 156.
Negro slavery, and Civil War, S. E. Morison on, 69–70.
Newhall, Richard A., gift, 162.
Newington Green, and J. Burgh, 40–41.
Nicolson, Francis, 156.
'95 Sewing Circle, records, 162.
Noyes, Edward J., letters, 162.
Noyes family, letters to, 162.
Noyes, Moses, deed, 164.
Norms, *Adams Papers*, publishing, 124.

OLIVER, Andrew, aid, 158; gift, 162.
Oliver, Edward P., gift, 162.
Oliver family, aid, 158.
Oliver, Peter, family and friends, contributions, 152.
Oliver, Mrs. Peter, aid, 158.
Oliver Room, 158; furnishings, 119; exhibition and reception, 158.
Owen, Robert, 156.

PAINE, John Bryant, Jr., report, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118; committees, Nominating, 119, Finance, chairman, 153, 161; Treasurer, 151, 152–155, 160–161, 163.
Palmer, Robert Roswell, Corresponding Member, 151, 159, 161.
Paper currency, 116.
The Papers of Alexander Hamilton, 162.
The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, ed. J. P. Boyd, 130, 145.
Papers of Henry Knox. *See* M.H.S., publications, Knox Papers.
Parker, William Stanley, gift, 162–163.
Past vs. present, similarities and differences, M. Hammond on, 3–17.
Paul Revere's Three Accounts of his Famous Ride, *M.H.S. Picture Book*, 159.
Payson, William Lincoln, Resident Member, 119, 159, 161.

Peace Convention, Va. summons, 58–59; start of, 60–61, 65–66; delegates, 61–64; propositions, 66–67, substitute, 68; oratory unlimited, 71–72; Seddon substitute propositions, 74–75; deadlocked, 75; final vote, 75–76, examination of, 76–78; significance, 78–80.
"The Peace Convention of February, 1861," by S. E. Morison, 58–80, 119.
Peabody family, MSS, 114.
Peabody Museum (of Salem), and L. W. Jenkins, 107–109.
Pemberton, Thomas, collector and copyist, 162.
"Perspective View of the Blockade of Boston," by C. Remick, reproduction, 157.
Phillips, Stephen, Resident Member, 115, 116, 159.
Phillips, Wendell, letter, 115.
Pictorial histories, 118.
Pinkham, Christopher, ciphering book, 164; whaling log, 164.
Pinkham, Nathaniel, whaling log, 164.
Pinkham, Zephaniah, whaling log, 164.
Pitt, William (1759–1806), signature, 162.
Police Strike, Boston, 156.
"Political Experience and Enlightenment Ideas in Eighteenth-Century America," by B. Bailyn, 114.
Politics, and H. L. Shattuck, 81–91.
Pratt, Aaron, power of administration, 163.
Prescott family (of Groton), MSS, 114.
Present vs. past, similarities and differences, M. Hammond on, 3–17.
Price-Burgis view, Boston, repairs, 116–117.
Proceedings of the M.H.S. See M.H.S., publications, *Proceedings*.
The Prophet, by K. Gibran, 100–101.
"Prospect," Boston, 25.
A Prospect of the Colledges at Cambridge in New England, by W. Burgis, 25.
Publication explosion, and *Adams Papers*, 145–146.
Publisher, A. A. Knopf recollections, 92–103.
Publishing, *Adams Papers* norms, 124.
Pusey, Nathan Marsh, luncheon guest, 120; speaker, 150.
Pyncheon, William, diary, additions, 162.

QUAKERS, 157.
Quincy, Stone Church, 116.
Quincy Bay, Moswetuset Hummock transfer, 117.
Quincy, Col. Josiah, 123; letters, 113.

"RANDOM Recollections of a Publisher," by A. A. Knopf, 92–103, 160.
Remick, Christian, "Perspective View . . . ," reproduction, 157.
Renwick, William Goodwin, Associate Member, 151, 159, 161.
Revere House, Boston, Chess Club banquet, 113.
Revere, Paul, exhibition, 158; *M.H.S. Picture Book* on, 159.
Revolution, American theory, and J. Burgh, 38–57.
Richmond, Carleton Rubira, House Committee, 161.
Riedesel, Friederike Charlotte Luise (von Massow), freifrau von, 156.
Riley, Stephen Thomas, 122, 150; sponsor, 113, 116, 119; reports, accessions, 113–114, 115, 116, 117–118, 119, 161–163, 164, Council, 155–159; shows Burgis-Price view, 116–117; elusive but laudable, T. B. Adams on, 123–124; thanks to, 152; committees, Meetings, 161, Membership, 161, Publication, 161.
Rockwood, Mrs. George I., gift, 163.
Rome, ancient, vs. modern America, M. Hammond on, 3–17.
"Roosevelt, Hoover, Stimson, and Interregnum Foreign Policy, November, 1932–March, 1933," by F. B. Freidel, Jr., 164.
Royall, Anne, and J. Q. Adams, 142, 149–150.
Rumford, Count von. *See* Sir Benjamin Thompson.

Ruzicka, Rudolph, 122.
Ryder, A. W., *A Correspondence with the Harvard University Press*, 126.

SACCO-VANZETTI Case, and artists, 156.
"Safety Valve Thesis: 1844," by F. Merk, 158.
Saltonstall family, 156; gift, 157.
Saltonstall, Leverett, aid, 157.
Saltonstall Papers, ed. R. E. Moody, 117, 157.
Sampler, A. Belknap, 116.
Sandwich Islands, missionaries, 163.
Savage, James, letters, 114, 162–163.
Seaver, Henry Latimer, 116; Vice-President, 151; Library Committee, 161.
Seccomb, Rev. John, author of *Father Abbey's Will*, 18, 24.
Seddon, James A., quoted, 69.
Sedgwick, Theodore, letter, 115.
Sequel, *Father Abbey's Will*, text quoted, 22–24.
Shattuck, Dr. George Cheever, gift, 114, 116.
Shattuck, Dr. George Cheyne, travel diary, 114.
Shattuck, Henry Lee, "Some Experiences of My Political Life," 81–91, 160; in state legislature, 81–82; and politics, start in, 81; in Boston City Council, 82; and bridges, 83–85; and insurance lobby, 85–86; and chiropractors, 86–87; and mental hospitals, 87–88; on Sen. W. E. McLane, 88; and P. A. Murray and traffic lights, 89; and J. P. Marquand, 89; and educational television, 89–90; on J. M. Curley's political deviousness, 90–91; comments, 115; Finance Committee, 153, 161.
Shaw, Robert Gould, deed, 164.
Shays's Rebellion, trials, 164.
Shelbourne (Shelburne), Lord, signature, 162.
Shipton, Clifford Kenyon, committees, Library, 161, Publication, 161, report, 163–164.
Sibley, John Langdon, quoted, 18.
Sibley's Harvard Graduates. See M.H.S., publications, *Sibley's Harvard Graduates.*
Silversmiths, colonial, 156.
Similarities and differences, past vs. present, M. Hammond on, 3–17.
Slater, Max, gift, 118.
Slavery, Negro, and Civil War, S. E. Morison on, 69–70.
Smith, Dwight L., gift, 162.
Smith, Theodore Clarke, death, 158.
"Some Experiences of My Political Life," by H. L. Shattuck, 81–91, 160.
Sprague, Waldo C., Estate of, gift, 163.
Springfield Bridge, and H. L. Shattuck, 83–84.
Stamp Act, 156.
Stinehour Press, 120.
Stone Church, Quincy, 116.
Stratton, Burton, 122.
Sumner, Charles, D. H. Donald biography, 149.
Sumner, Gov. Increase, letter, 164; invitations to, 164.
Sumner, Mrs. Increase, letter to, 164; invitations to, 164.
Supreme Court, history, 156.
Swan, James, invitations, 164.

TALES *of Jacob*, by T. Mann, 94–95.
Talleyrand-Perigord, Charles Maurice de, 156.
Tavern Club, Boston, *Adams Papers* luncheon, 120, 158.
Taylor, Edward, poetry, 156.
Television, educational, and H. L. Shattuck, 89–90.
Thacher, Peter, letter, copy, 163.
Thaxter, John, letter to, 162.
Theory, American revolutionary, and J. Burgh, 38–57.
This Simian World, by C. Day, 96.
Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, imprint, 160.
Thomas Jefferson's Architectural Drawings, M.H.S. Picture Book, 2nd edn., 160.

Thomas, Milton Halsey, Corresponding Member, 113, 114, 159.
Thompson, Sir Benjamin, Count von Rumford, 156.
Thompson, Edward K., luncheon guest, 120.
Thoughts Without Words, by C. Day, 96.
Three Episodes of Massachusetts History, by C. F. Adams, 141.
Time, Inc., 136, 146.
Trade, India, 156.
Traffic lights, and H. L. Shattuck and P. A. Murray, 89.
Transcendentalism, N. E., 156.
Truman, President Harry S., and N.H.S.P., 145.
Trustees, Adams Manuscript Trust, 122, 142–146.
Tudor family, MSS, 115.
Tudor, William, correspondence, 115.
Tudor, Mrs. William. *See* Miss Delia Jarvis.
Tufts, Cotton, 1769 diary, 115.
Tutivillus, Devil's agent, 131–132.

UNION WHARF, sale document, 162.
United States Navy, in East, 156.
United States vs. ancient Rome, M. Hammond on, 3–17.
University of Virginia Press, imprint, 160.

VARNUM family, MSS, 119.
Varnum, Joseph Bradley, MSS, 119.
Viets, Dr. Henry Rouse, remarks, 114; gift, 118.
The Vintage Mencken, ed. A. Cooke, 102.
Virginia, summons Peace Convention, 58–59; legal history, 156; University of, Press, 160.
von Keudell, Baron Rudolph, gift, 116.
Voyages, Northwest coast, 18th century, 156.

WAINWRIGHT, Nicholas Biddle, Corresponding Member, 113, 159.
Ward, Gen. Artemas, letters to, 115.
Warren, Howland Shaw, Resources Committee, chairman, 161.
Washington, D. C., in 1861, 65.
Washington, George, death, material on, 162.
Webster, Sir Charles Kingsley, death, 150, 159.
Webster, Daniel, MSS, 113.
Weinstein, Charlotte B. (Mrs. Jerome E.), M.H.S. secretary, resigns, 159.
Welles, B. Sumner, gift, 162, 164.
Welles family, letters, 162.
Whaling logs, 164.
Wheatland, Stephen, absent, 115; Vice-President, 151.
White, Aaron, notebook-diaries, 114.
Whitehill, Walter Muir, 152; sponsor, 115; absent, 116, 117, 163; Recording Secretary, 151; committees, Membership, 161, Publication, 161.
Whitney, Mrs. Bertha Shaw, gift, 116.
Wiggins, J. Russell, luncheon guest, 120.
Wilder, Mrs. Amos, gift, 115.
Williams, Miss Mary E., gift, 162.
Williams, Moses, material on, 162.
Williams, Revel, deed, 164.
Wilson, Thomas James, 123, 126; gift, 115, 157; committees, Nominating, chairman, 119, Membership, 161; speaker, 119–120, 150; remarks, 124.
Winthrop family, 156.
Winthrop, Nathaniel, gift, 163.
Winthrop Papers, cataloguer. *See* Jane T. Christie.
Winthrop Papers. *See* M.H.S., publications, *Winthrop Papers*.
Winthrop, Wait Still, letter, 115.
Witches, 156.
Woodward, Comer Vann, Corresponding Member, 119, 159, 161.
Worcester, Joseph E., letter to, 119.
World War II, pictorial history, 118.

The Works of John Adams, ed. C. F. Adams, 137.
Wrecked Among Cannibals in the Fijis, by L. W. Jenkins, 108.
Writings of John Quincy Adams, ed. W. C. Ford, 139–140.
YALE University, and *Franklin Papers*, 146.
Youth and the Bright Medusa, by W. Cather, 99.
Young, Benjamin Loring, "Martin Lomasney as I Knew Him," 115.